

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS
EDITED BY

B-482

THE HISTORY AND
MEANING OF THE
CATHOLIC INDEX
OF FORBIDDEN
BOOKS

Joseph McCabe

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS

GIRARD

- - -



- - -

KANSAS

The History and Meaning of the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books

Joseph McCabe

Haldeman-Julius Company
Girard, Kansas

Copyright,
Haldeman-Julius Company

Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. The Censorship in the Dark Ages.....	13
II. From Censorship to Index.....	20
III. The Early Indexes.....	29
IV. The Congregation of the Index.....	37
V. The Censorship in Other Lands.....	45
VI. The Bible As a Prohibited Book.....	55
VII. The New Rome and Its Prohibitions.....	62
VIII. Some Curiosities of the Index.....	69
IX. Benedict XIV Reforms the Index.....	76
X. The Censorship in France and Spain.....	83
XI. The Revolution and the Reaction.....	90
XII. Rome Pretends to Modernize.....	96
XIII. The Index Today.....	101

THE HISTORY AND MEANING OF THE CATHOLIC INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS

INTRODUCTION THE STUPIDITY OF THE INDEX

TWO years ago (1929) the Vatican, having won the acclamation of the world's press by the profound and serene wisdom of its policy in Italy, proceeded to issue a new edition of its famous Index of Forbidden Books. I commend the study of that quaint little volume to any who are tempted to entertain the myth of the statesmanship of the Church of Rome. There are doubtless large numbers of Catholics, apart from the illiterate or half-literate millions who swell the grand total of the Pope's subjects, who share the perplexities and would intelligently approach the problems of our modern life. The first question in the mind of all such thoughtful people, who have not themselves expert knowledge of the subjects we discuss, is: What shall we read to be saved? And one of the first acts of Pius XI after regaining his imperial purple was to issue to their spiritual guides an educational manual which must have brought a smile to the lips of even the corpulent priests of the more drowsy villages of Italy.

I do not mean that the Index has made no progress since the days when the Popes and cardinals and monks were so rudely disturbed in their prayers and amours by the Lutheran earthquake. You will search this new issue in vain for some of the more delicious errors which brightened the early Indexes. The Cycle of the Arthurian Legends no longer appears as some grim gentleman named "Thomas Arthur of Britain" who menaces our faith or morals. Poor Anne Askew, who, moreover, never perpetrated a line of print, no longer figures, as she did until a relatively late date, as some poisonous writer of mysterious nationality named A. S. Kenne. The legendary wizard Merlin is no longer represented as an author from whose books we need to be protected by a sage authority. "Farrago" is no longer spelt "Dragale"; nor is homely old Johann Pupper of Goch split up into three formidable and unrecognizable heretics. Yet on the broadest view the Index is, in its latest dress, fresh from the new scientific presses of the Vatican, hardly less ridiculous than it was in those artless early editions.

In the first place, of the many thousands of works which are listed in this prohibitory guide to literature of the year 1929 at least three-fourths are now so rare that even Mr. J. P. Morgan would hardly succeed in procuring a copy; and more than nine-tenths are now so void of interest even to a Catholic that no one in the world would be tempted to read them if they were obtainable. Did you ever hear of a French theologian of the seventeenth century named Launoy? I do not choose his name as a sample. He is quite well known in comparison with

thousands of others on the list. The point is that the ravages of the works of this Launoy are so much dreaded in our age by these wise statesmen of Rome that he occupies three times as much space in this modern Index as any other pestilential writer. Of the three or four thousand authors against whom we are warned there is hardly one in ten who comes nearer to us than the end of the eighteenth century, and I doubt if there is one in ten of whom the most learned professor of literature ever heard. Yet the Index is not offered to us as an historical monument. It professes to adapt its service to the need of each succeeding age.

We will return in the last chapter to the consideration of the Index in this light and reflect for a moment on the small minority of familiar names. Quite certainly there are on the list many works, written before the year 1800, which a Catholic can get and may be tempted to read, and the Pope proscribes them. We shall see later by what desperate and dubious arguments American Catholic writers, in spite of the stern assurances of their Pope, disown the obligations of the Index. Let us here take a world-view. There were many works published between 1600 and 1800 of such distinction and importance that we still reprint them and read them with living interest. They are not merely milestones in the recent progress of the race. They are in a very large measure the causes of the progress. They are works of literary genius, of historical momentousness, usually of fine constructive idealism: the works which the editor of any new Classical Library places first on his list.

And they are all on the List of Forbidden Books. The Catholic must not read them without humbly craving permission. Some of these "bad books" will surprise you. The list includes Lord Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," Sir Thomas Browne's fascinating "Religio Medici," Laurence Sterne's "Sentimental Journey." Naturally the Catholic knows that he must have a very definite opinion about Voltaire and Rousseau, Bayle and Gibbon, without daring to read them, but does he know that it is just as perilous and damnable to read a reprint of Montaigne's superb "Essays," of Montesquieu's epoch-making "Spirit of the Laws," Beccaria's world-moving work "Crime"? Does he know that the chief works of Kant and Descartes, of Hobbes and Locke and Hume, are on the Black List? He must never open the famous French Encyclopedia of the eighteenth century to see what its writers really said, but he may be more surprised to learn that he is not permitted to read Milton's "Letters," Bishop Berkeley's "Alciphron," or Richardson's "Pamela." He may—pray remember that this is Vatican guidance of the year 1929—read Charles Darwin but he may not read the almost forgotten scientific poetry of his grandfather Erasmus. He may read Rabelais and Boccaccio and Margaret of Navarre, but Pius XI assures him that to read the austere pages of Grotius or Spinoza would ruin his spiritual health. As to the leading Protestant writers who describe the medieval Church they quitted, he must learn from his Catholic guides how stupid, how mendacious, how malevolent and indecent they were; but he must not attempt to verify this.

The comedy is sustained when we turn from the many thousands of books which no one is ever tempted to read, and very few could read,

and ask for guidance about the enormously larger, more appealing, more accessible literature of modern times. It is an ancient joke that the Index is a guide to the world's best literature. This fairly holds good for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and that Rome should encourage the joke by keeping on its Index the works I have named is, frankly, a piece of incredible stupidity. But the joke ceases to apply to literature, except perhaps to French literature, after the year 1800. Only a few hundred writers or works after that date are included, and the selection is comic. For instance, as far as the Index is concerned any Catholic may read my books, and, especially in Little Blue Book and Big Blue Book form, there must be something like ten millions of them in circulation in the English-speaking world, while some have been translated into French, Italian, Spanish, Russian, Danish and Japanese. The Index finds them too innocent or too uninfluential for notice, while it sternly forbids the Catholic to read Andrew Lang's mild "Myth, Ritual and Religion," of which you probably never heard. The Catholic may, as far as the Index is concerned, enjoy Haeckel's "Riddle" (which has sold several million copies) or "Büchner's equally drastic and almost equally distributed "Force and Matter," or even Paine's "Age of Reason"; but he must shudderingly avoid Oliver Goldsmith's "History of England," Robertson's "Charles the Fifth," and Roscoe's quite admiring "Life of Leo X." He may read my History of the Papacy, but he must not open Hallam, whom nobody now ever does open. And this Index, which passes as innocuous the works of Wells and Shaw and A. D. White, the fiery poetry of Swinburne and the lectures of Ingersoll, gravely puts its ban on Archbishop Whately's "Logic" and John Stuart Mill's "Political Economy." Such is the Olympian wisdom of "the greatest Pope in many generations."

You may say that, since it damns no American work, except one or two obscure pamphlets, and forbids only a few modern English works which nobody wants to read, the Index at least leaves us a most admirable measure of freedom. I will tell presently how the general rules of the Index and of the Church shatter this illusive liberty, but let us continue a moment longer to examine the list of the damned authors. Let us be liberal and grant that the list, as such, lays no disability on ninety-nine and a fraction Catholics out of every hundred. Some years ago I showed, as the outcome of a severe inquiry, that of the Pope's 190,000,000 genuine subjects 120,000,000 are unable to read, and the reading of more than half the remainder does not rise above the modest cultural level of the weekly Catholic paper. In any case, no American or British Catholic wants to read the authors I have just quoted, and few other Catholics are aware of their existence. But a good many people in every civilized country would, for instance, like some acquaintance with the French literature of the last hundred years. Well, the poor Catholic must contrive to do this without reading a line of, in addition to the earlier French writers I named, Balzac, Flaubert, Comte, Cousin, Stendhal, Taine, Condorcet, Proudhon, Renan, Heine, George Sand, the two Dumas, Zola, and Anatole France. Here again the discrimination is often ludicrous. The Catholic must not read the very virtuous works of Maurice Maeterlinck, but he may read Baudelaire's "Flower of Evil." He must not

read the puritanical Comte and Cousin, but he may enjoy the naughtiest novels of A. Daudet, Theophile, Gautier, and Maupassant. In short, he may read the whole range of recent works in which all the resources of our new knowledge are marshalled against religion or virtue, but he must not read Edgar Quinet, who died nearly sixty years ago, and must never make use of Larousse's indispensable encyclopaedic dictionary.

You will ask what, in the name of sanity, is the meaning of the periodical republication of this list of obscure literary fossils, with a small proportion of modern writers which grows smaller as literature becomes more skeptical. One is disposed to suggest to the Catholic apologist that he might neatly illustrate the function of the Index by pointing to the pole outside our barbers' shops, which is an artistic souvenir of the days when the barbers bled folk once or twice a week. But the apologist is rather sensitive on the subject of bleeding in earlier centuries. Moreover he does not, and dare not, say that the Index merely professes to be something, or a reminiscence of something, that was useful in earlier times. The Pope very emphatically says that it is a live and entirely respectable organ of his Church. It is, as a matter of fact, with its naive absurdities, a very delicate subject for the apologist, in spite of his remarkable resourcefulness and the receptiveness of his Catholic readers. I fancy that the first book he would like to put on the Index is the Index. In our large and guileless charity we now invite Catholics to write about their institutions in our works of reference. In, for instance, not only the Encyclopaedia Britannica, but the much more serious Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, the article on the Index is written by Canon Boudhinon. In standard works of this type he is permitted to impose on us the puerilities which are safe in his own protected area: as that "bad books are dangerous," and that the reading of them "concerns society as a whole." But he does not make the feeblest effort to prove that the Index, as I described it, has any use today. Dr. Putnam in his very extensive bibliography of the Index, refers us to a popular work by Father G. M. Searle. But I do not find that it mentions the Index; nor is it mentioned in that particularly audacious piece of popular apologetics, "The Calvert Handbook of Catholic Facts."

What the Pope and one or two Jesuits have to say about the matter we shall see later, but we may frankly take the Index to be a sort of vestigial organ, a relic of medieval Catholicism, and confine ourselves to its historical interest. Putting one modern author out of a hundred on the index is merely a silly gesture; especially when the one is a liberal Protestant like Sabatier or an ethical-culture person like Maeterlinck. The Popes have some vague oriental idea that they save their faces by periodically republishing the Index and decorating it with the names of one or two recent writers. The clergy, for whom alone it is written, take no notice of it. I doubt (from clerical experience) if one in a hundred of them ever saw a copy of it. The laity never see it; they just have a confused idea that a body of most learned men in Rome is watching, year by year, the world's production of literature, judging it with profound sagacity, guarding their beautiful heritage of truth as no other Church in the world does. It is not of the least practical importance today, for the simple reason that every Catholic is taught from early years that it

is a "sin" to read books which criticize his faith or raise his sexual temperature by a fraction of a degree.

On the other hand, the historical interest of the Index is very considerable. Now that even our encyclopaedias are written by Catholics, in so far as they relate to Catholic matters, you will be familiar with the apologetic argument. Indeed, the argument is so suave, so confident, so ingenuous that it is almost wrong to call it apologetic. No man of common sense expects any apology for anything in the history of the Catholic Church once he knows the truth about it. That is the new note. The Index! Surely the most natural and inevitable of institutions. For centuries the Catholic Church had been left to discharge the function of guiding and educating the race which the secular powers had neglected. When printing was invented and education extended to a broader class, the Church merely continued its function of guarding people's ideas from contamination by controlling the presses and publishing warning lists of wicked books which eluded its vigilance. Even Roman emperors had censored books. All secular governments today censor books. And if—mind you, we do not admit this, but if—the Catholic authorities went beyond others in their censorship, it proves only their exceptional conscientiousness and their consciousness that the truths *they* had to guard are peculiarly sacred and salutary.

This indecent travesty of the historical facts is too easily admitted into our modern literature. It is, for instance, not merely endorsed but most painfully elaborated in the late Dr. G. H. Putnam's "Censorship of the Church of Rome" (two volumes, 1906), which, to the joy of the Church, is generally recommended by academic authorities and works of reference as the most scholarly and impartial study of the subject. One is surprised only that Dr. Putnam was not made a Count of the Holy Roman Kingdom. Twenty years ago my friend Putnam, who often scolded me for the ruthlessness of my writings, of which he generously published many, gave me a copy of his work, with a delicate insinuation that that is how I ought to write on Catholic subjects. I prefer to tell the truth; and, candidly, my friend's anxiety to conciliate Catholics led him to believe and to say much that is mischievously untrue. His work is not a piece of scholarship—in its more solid sections it is simply an abridged translation of Reusch's "Index der verboten Bücher"—it is often inaccurate in detail, and it passes on to the general public some of the worst sophistries and untruths of the apologist.

Dr. Putnam has even improved upon his Jesuit advisers in formulating the argument that, since everybody left education to the Church, it was "reasonable" that it should set up a strict censorship of books. He even calls this "control" "less autocratic and burdensome" than the censorship in Protestant states. How little serious effort he made to check the conventional views on these matters is lamentably exposed when he says that the education of the people had been in the hands of the Church alone "for the space of fifteen centuries" when Lutheranism arose. We at once deduct four of these centuries, the first four, as the time when the Roman Empire notoriously educated the people. During seven of the remaining centuries, or from 400 to 1100 A. D., the people were not educated by anybody; and even from 1100 to 1550 the proportion of

men with even primary education did not, apart from the clergy, amount to five per cent. I have given the evidence repeatedly, and no responsible writer on the history of education differs. Yet Dr. Putnam makes the extraordinary statement that "the peasants" or "common people" of Germany were in the sixteenth century better educated than they are in any country today, and that they owed this education "almost entirely to the priests of the Church of Rome." Not one per cent of them was educated.

After these remarkable statements, which are held to show that it was "reasonable" for the Church to protect the world it had educated, Dr. Putnam goes on to say, not to prove, that the Church used its powers quite honestly and conscientiously and with less harshness than Protestant countries would later do. He may have winced when, ten years later, he published my "Crises in the History of the Papacy," which, as far as it goes, tells the truth about the Popes and Church of the sixteenth century. But we will return to this when the point arises in the course of the present work. It is this reluctance to read candid accounts of Papal history, this inclination to read Jesuits like Hilgers as if they were quite incapable of trickery, that cause Dr. Putnam to say that there was not only more censorship in Protestant countries but that it was "directed on the whole by a less wholesome, dignified, and honorable purpose." All this is taken direct from Father Hilgers. But Dr. Putnam has an expert knowledge of the book-trade at least, and he is compelled often to contradict himself. He on one page, speaking of the effect of the Index in Spain, says that we have "no data for ascertaining the extent of the loss" to the country, and he later admits that the book-trade in Spain was almost annihilated. Everyone, at all events, knows to what cultural condition Spain and Italy were reduced.

These points will arise later. I make these few reflections here on Dr. Putnam's introduction to his subject rather for the benefit of any of my readers who may chance to hesitate between what are called the tolerant and the militant attitudes toward Roman Catholic institutions. This new charity, at its best—for we cannot ignore the fact that it now pays—leads to a great deal of most false historical education. Its defenders are apt to retort that the militant attitude also leads to untruth since it is one-sided. The retort is feeble and unsound. The critic does not profess, like the diplomatic writer or the apologist, to tell the whole truth about Catholic history or institutions. He sets out to tell the ugly truths which are generally suppressed and to expose the untruths of those who record the Church's supposed virtues. He is, nevertheless, so far from being one-sided that he expressly desires that people should read both sides, and his opponents expressly do not.

It is in this mood that I approach the subject of the Index and offer the reader, by way of introduction, a general conception of it. Dr. Putnam very properly entitles his book "The Censorship of the Church of Rome." Lengthy lists of books were naturally not published before the invention of printing, but this invention merely led to an extension of a censorship of books that the Church had exercised since the second century. Indeed the practice of publishing lists of forbidden books did not begin with the invention of printing, as Putnam admits, but with the

development of Protestantism. A list of books published by Louvain University—on the fringe of the Protestant area, you will notice—in the year 1546, or about a century after the invention of printing, is counted the first Index. This was copied in Venice, which was on the highway from Protestant to Catholic areas, and Rome did not adopt the practice until ten years later. Nearly all the books on these lists were Protestant books and pamphlets. I will show that there were actually more writers condemned in the fourteenth century than during the seventy years after the invention of printing. As for the miserable pretext that the Church was just as concerned about “immoral” as about heretical books, one has only to reflect that those seventy years after Gutenberg were the period of the Renaissance, a period of extreme sexual freedom, yet the Church condemned hardly any of the numerous “obscene” books and plays, some of which had been written in the Vatican.

The Index is, therefore, broadly and truly, a new development of the Church's constant practice of silencing critics of its teaching and its ways. To say that this was a sincere, devout, unselfish reaction of the Church to the appearance of heretics is just as false as to say that it was a piece of self-interested priestcraft from beginning to end. No one (as far as I know) questions that Torquemada was devout, sincere, and honest; but no one who has made a serious study of the Spanish Inquisition doubts that amongst its spies, informers, and clerical officials there were at least ten men who primarily sought the wealth of the victim, which was divided amongst them, for every disinterested fanatic. The new literary policy is to stress the honesty of the Torquemadas and suppress the far more general scramble for blood and gold. So it was in regard to the censorship. Many a Pope or bishop honestly thought that the spread of heresy, since it entailed the eternal damnation of souls, ought to be arrested by any means; and just as demonstrably others, trampling themselves on the sternest commands of their religion, had no such delicacy of feeling and were zealous merely to protect the system which ensured for them power and luxury. The detailed facts of each age must tell us the proportion of each type. But what I have said in earlier works about the prolonged and deep corruption of the Roman Church justify us at least in saying that it is a far greater untruth to represent the attitude of that Church toward heretics and their writings as entirely honest and unselfish than to represent it as entirely dishonest and selfish; while any attempt to defend the Index in our time on the pretext that the Church is still protecting souls from eternal damnation—for honestly rejecting its teaching—ought at once to be denounced as a moral and intellectual outrage.

We will therefore wait until we have seen all the facts before we say whether the Index was a predominantly selfish attempt to protect the power and wealth of the Church by preventing further secessions. But on the Index in another aspect we need not hesitate to pass sentence. In so far as it was effective, in so far as its prohibitions could be enforced by fines, spiritual terrors, torture, and death, it was a crime against the interests of the human race and one of the chief reasons why the attainment of a high civilization in Europe was so long delayed. If any man feels that this language is intemperate, let him reflect that it was only

in Spain, Portugal, the Papal States, and a few other regions where Spain or the Popes had full power that the Index was strictly enforced. The result is surely well known. Their literature shriveled, and they were the last countries to rise to the level of modern civilization. We smile today when we see on the Index the names of Hobbes and Locke, Montaigne and Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau, but historically the matter is very serious. To such writers we now confidently trace the revolutions of the eighteenth century which prepared the way for our modern advance. Those writers were effectively kept out of Spain, Portugal, the Papal States, and Naples. Yet we are asked to listen respectfully to claims that the Roman Church contributed to the moral, social, and intellectual progress of the race.

And to the rights of the race let us add the rights of the individual. The system of censorship is today breaking down in the Church itself because Catholics are beginning to reflect that the restrictions which are laid on their diet or their reading or their right to limit their families are purely priest-made laws. They have so long submitted to what seems to outsiders a degrading disability—the refusal of the right to hear the other side—for two reasons. One was the teaching of the Church that a Catholic who disowned his creed, for whatever reason, went surely to hell. But even Catholic writers in America are now ashamed to repeat this opinion of their medieval-minded Pope. They have risen to the splendid audacity of admitting that honest disbelief, even in a seceded Catholic, may not after all be punished with eternal torment! The second reason was that Catholics are drenched from their childhood with hypnotic assurances that *their* faith is so peculiarly precious and sacred that it must be guarded by unique methods. They are beginning to reflect that this sort of thing puts the priest on the same level as the Spiritualist medium who persuades his dupes that darkness or a dim light is necessary for his display. In other words, Catholics are beginning to assert their rights; and the non-Catholic authors who talk about the right of the Church to “protect its members” might reflect that the members never did desire such “protection” and are today resenting it.

For this is the last aspect of the Index or of the general censorship that we need notice here. From the start this system of prohibition, enforced by the direst penalties, enabled the writers of the Church to impose shamelessly on the people. Even Catholic historians now admit that there were very serious disorders in the medieval Church, yet the facts were shockingly misrepresented and the Reformation travestied in countries where the censorship was enforced. Not only the works in which devout Protestants explained their secession but books in which devout Catholics exposed the evils only to ask a remedy of them were put on the Index. This determination to keep the truth from Italian Catholics went so far that Pope Paul IV, the author of the first Roman Index, actually put on it a memoir on the disorders of the Church which he had himself written when he was a cardinal of the reform party! The few indecent writers who were put on the Index were generally so treated because they gave a truthful picture of the sex-life of priests, monks, and nuns. They were merely expurgated by turning the peccant abbesses into countesses and the ribald monks into carpenters or attorneys.

Far more serious was the gross perversion, in the interest of the Papacy, of the earlier history of the Church. The most learned writers of the Catholic Counter-Reformation, such as Cardinal Baronius and Cardinal Bellarmine, resorted to this crime under the shelter of the Index. Earlier Catholic writers who had exposed the forgeries they used, and Protestant critics who exposed their use of them, were all explicitly put on the Index, and the work went on merrily. I have repeatedly shown how, even to our own time, this consciousness that their readers are forbidden to read critics has made Catholic writers the most reckless and untruthful in literature. It is another point which the new apologists for the Index ignore. The stupidity of the Index in its latest edition merely reminds us how arbitrarily the Church has been accustomed to act in its protected areas. It is today a comparatively humane stupidity, because the world will not suffer the Church to enforce its laws, but the history of the censorship is a story of Rome's cruel and pernicious interference with that free interchange of ideas which is the first condition of human progress.

CHAPTER I

THE CENSORSHIP IN THE DARK AGES



VERY work on the Index begins with this quotation from *Acts*, XIX, 19:

Many of them also which used curious [magical] arts brought their books together and burned them before all men.

Many editions of the Roman Index have this text as their motto. Most writers remark that we have here not a strict precedent, since the surrender of the books was voluntary, but I know no writer who reminds his readers how the second part of the text runs. It is this:

and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver.

This at once puts the story in the region of myth, and no serious historian ought to notice it without a caution. A "piece of silver" in ancient Ephesus, where this remarkable effect of Paul's teaching is located, might be twenty cents or a hundred times as much, or even more. If we take the pieces of silver as the smallest known in the Greek world, the bonfire cost about ten thousand dollars, but Greek scholars tell us that a sum four or five times as large is meant. So we are asked to believe that Paul's converts at Ephesus, who used to meet in each others small houses to break bread, were really so numerous and wealthy that between them they could produce \$40,000 worth of manuscripts on magic alone! One may seriously doubt if there were twenty thousand works on magic in the whole of Ephesus, and the Christians were notoriously a small and poor community. Yet one grave scholar after another opens his treatise with a serious account of that mythical bonfire in the central square of Ephesus. I fear it is typical of much that is to come.

The learned writers then find the second relevant fact in the year 150 A. D. In or about that year, it is said, a synod of bishops in Asia

Minor, probably again at Ephesus, forbade the faithful to read a work entitled "The Acts of St. Paul." Dr. Putnam and other historians opine that the work was condemned because it was "not authentic"—as if the narrative I have just quoted from Acts *was* authentic—but the real reason is interesting, and it throws some light on the beginning of censorship. It is the opinion of most scholars that an ancient work of the early Church which we still have, "The Acts of Paul and Thecla," is part of the condemned work, and I showed in one of the Little Blue Books that Thecla is merely a personification of certain ideas that were current in the phallic region of Asia Minor. The treatise itself, let me say, is not at all erotic, but it does represent the virgin Thecla as holding a very prominent position in the early Church, and that is why the bishops attempted to suppress it. The first authentic act of censorship was in the interest of the masculine monopoly of offices in the growing Church.

By this time, it is probable, the practice of forbidding the faithful to read certain books was quite common in the Church. Writers on the Index overlook the Gnostic controversy which fiercely agitated the Christian communities in every city of the Greek and Asiatic world. As soon as educated men were attracted to the Church, as they were to Mithraism and other ascetic religions, they began to resent the stark literalism of the tradition about Jesus and to invest it with a symbolic meaning by means of the Neoplatonic philosophy. A score of men of ability wrote books in this sense, and the bishops fought them with much more vigor than courtesy. There must have been lists of scores, if not hundreds, of books that the faithful were forbidden to read.

Thus, while the writer on the Index skips from 55 A. D. to 150 and then to the year 325, there is plenty of evidence that the censorship of books continued during that time in every city of the Christian world. But even what the Council of Nicaea did in 325 is not of much interest. The famous Arius had written a work, "Thalia," in which he put his satirical arguments in verse as well as prose. His followers sang his poems in the streets, and even the pagan comedians in the theaters took "gags" from this strange fighting in the streets about the divinity of Jesus. The episcopal condemnation of the book does not seem to have had much effect, even when it was endorsed by the Emperor Constantine. It was in the year after his participation in the Council of Nicaea, where he so edifyingly kissed the scars of the martyrs, that Constantine had his son and his wife brutally murdered, so that there was not much moral authority behind his censorship. When he went on to condemn the work of the learned Porphyry, the only pagan philosopher of importance to criticize the Church, the Roman and Greek pagans smiled; and the fact that Porphyry's work had to be condemned again sixty-three years later shows how futile this kind of censorship was.

In the year 398, therefore, the bishops induced the Emperor Arcadius to take a more drastic step. The diligence with which our scholars bring to light every obscure fact that is relevant to their inquiries must command our admiration, but it has one serious disadvantage. Their works on the Index become dry and terse chronicles in which each fact has to be recorded so briefly that significant circumstances are not noticed. Thus they invariably fail here to tell that the Emperor Arcadius who first

attached the gravest penalties of criminal behavior to the reading of forbidden books was a weak-witted youth of twenty-one, who was as clay in the hands of the episcopal plotters. The bishops said little about the extraordinary depravity of the imperial court, but they persuaded the pimply youth in the purple to pass sentence of death on any who read the works of Eunomius. It is hardly necessary to add that Eunomius was their chief critic at the time. So they persuaded the emperor to put those who read his works on a level with those who possessed works on magic, and the penalty for this was death in Roman law.

Perhaps I ought to explain this curious position of magic in Roman life and law. One often reads in recent books and essays that the spread of the arts of magic and astrology in the Roman Empire was a symptom of its decay: a sort of fungoid growth on the rotting tree, so they say. These writers do not seem to know that magic and astrology were universal in the Babylonian civilization in its best days, and that they were far more cultivated in the full vigor of the Middle Ages than they ever were in the cities of the Roman Empire, in which they were confined to obscure charlatans and their dupes. One has only to remember that they incurred sentence of capital punishment, for those who cultivated them—the “mathematicians,” as Roman law called them—were often involved in murder-plots. In the fourth century they were several times accused of conspiring against the life of the emperor. Thus the real beginning of censorship was when the bishops induced a feeble-minded young emperor to extend the brutal sentence of the civil code to those who read the refined works of Eunomius.

After Porphyry, Arius, and Eunomius, the most learned writer who was felt to be in some measure hostile to the dogmas which the synods were now creating was Origen, so he also was put on the primitive Index. The Council of Alexandria proscribed his works in the year 399. It seems at first strange to read that the shaggy monks of Alexandria, who would in a few years murder Hypatia, warmly resisted the condemnation, but they acted on a sentiment of local patriotism. Although Alexandria had been for many centuries the metropolis of Greek culture, Origen was almost the only scholar the Christian community of the city had produced, and the monks protested that one could read his works without being tainted by his mild heresies. He was put on the black list, and the names of Nestorian, Manichæan, and other critics were presently added. Theodosius II, another young emperor of feeble intelligence, was induced to put the readers of all these works on the same footing of criminality. In the year 446 Pope Leo I drew up quite a long list of writings which the faithful were ordered to burn. Manichæans were still active in spite of fifty years of ruthless persecution, and there were a dozen heresies and schisms in every part of the Empire.

It looked, indeed, at this time as if the unity of the Church would be finally shattered. The imperial power, which had been used to enforce an artificial unity, was in the dust, and as a rule the bishops could do no more than threaten heretics with spiritual penalties at which they smiled; though the Spanish Church already distinguished itself by burning a heretic, and in the east the Emperor Justinian and his wife Theodora of the Brothel, atoned for their luxurious sins by ordering that the

hands be cut off any man who touched an heretical work. From this point onward, however, we may ignore the degenerate Greek Church and its savage persecutions. In the west the danger which seemed to arise when imperial troops could no longer be used to enforce the wishes of the bishops was soon neutralized by the rapid and appalling spread of ignorance. The literature of the heretics and pagans perished, and by the end of the fifth century there were, in any case, few who could have read them.

Singularly enough, we find the first extensive list of condemned books issued by the Church of Rome at this period, according to most of our authorities. Pope Gelasius presided over a synod of his clergy at Rome in the year 494, and amongst his extant decrees is a list which is supposed to have been drawn up by this synod. Dr. Putnam seems here to have deserted the guidance of the learned if somewhat oppressive Reusch for the treacherous lead of his Jesuit friends. This list is not, he says, an index of prohibited books, because it says only what books are or are not used for official reading in the Roman Church. Many writers make the same mistake. I have only to point out that the positive or approbatory part of the list includes, besides the Bible, all the works of the Fathers, the historical works of Orosius and Rufinier, and many others. There is no question here of "public" reading, and therefore in the second part the decree is a genuine index of prohibited books.

It is peculiar and interesting, for the Pope now falls heavily upon Christian instead of heretical literature. He is chiefly concerned with apocryphal gospels and epistles and spurious lives of martyrs, and he gives us an extensive knowledge of the weird literature which still circulated, as books of the New Testament, in the Church. It seems that people read gospels of Thaddeus, Matthias, Peter, James, Barnabas, Thomas, Bartholomew, Andrew, and Lucian: Acts of Andrew, Paul and Thecla, Thomas, Peter and Philip: Revelations of Paul, Thomas, and Stephen: and quaint works like "The Penitence of Adam," "The Daughters of Adam," "The Book of Ogias" (a giant who fought a dragon after the Flood), "The Infancy of the Savior," "The Assumption of the Virgin," and the letters of King Abgar to Jesus and of Jesus to Abgar. It is clear here again that the Pope refers to private, not public reading, for there was no question of such books being read in church anywhere. They reflect a surprising condition of credulity, and the general tendency of the rejected gospels is significant. They show the story of the miraculous birth of Jesus and the glorification of Mary, which are completely wanting in the first gospel, Mark, steadily expanding until it becomes the full-blown romance of "The Infancy of the Savior," which describes the boy Jesus striking his playmates dead when they interfere with his games or breathing life into his clay pigeons. On the other hand, although the age of the fabrication of lives of martyrs had now begun, only two of the more outrageous of these (including the St. George legend) are named.

As the papal censure was not now supported by the civic arm, it seems to have been futile, since we have today copies of nearly all these apocryphal works, which you may read in an English translation. This is the kind of literature that the monks preserved for us. But the thoughtful reader will surely like to ask me why, if Europe had by this

time fallen into a condition of general illiteracy, it was necessary to publish a list of prohibited books. As a matter of fact, this decree is in various very ancient manuscripts attributed to Pope Damasus, who had died more than a hundred years earlier, and I believe that in substance it does go back to Damasus, whose secretary was the learned St. Jerome, and was republished by Gelasius with a few additions. Apart from the clergy there cannot have been much reading at the end of the fifth century. Even the monks were for the most part, as St. Benedict would presently say, gross and illiterate. But this was just the age when Theodoric the Goth was making the last attempt to preserve the old culture, and the re-issue of an old papal decree by Gelasius seems to reflect that last faint gleam of intellectual life. Then the darkness closed in, when the Papacy destroyed the work of Theodoric and his gifted daughter.

I cannot resist the inclination here to poke a little fun at my friend Dr. Putnam and the weaknesses into which his conciliatory attitude betrayed him. "For fifteen centuries [to 1550] the education of the people had remained almost exclusively under the direction of the Church," he says (p. 10). That he means education in the technical, not in a broader sense, he makes clear by going on to say that "the instruction given in the parish schools instituted by the Church was almost entirely oral." One can learn from any modern manual of the history of education that, as I have shown elsewhere, these schools are entirely mythical, and St. Gregory even closed the one such school that a bishop opened in his time. But the amusing feature is that when Putnam comes to describe the censorship of books after Gelasius, he can, although he has the advantage of all research up to date, find only five acts of clerical censorship in Europe between the year 500 and the year 1050, in five and a half of those centuries during which the Church is supposed to have been educating the public; and three of these five condemnations refer merely to certain martyr-legends in which the monk-fabricators seem to have exceeded the very generous license they had. Dr. Putnam does not venture to suggest, as the Jesuits would like him to do, that during these five centuries there were no condemnations because the Church was beautifully united in its intellectual attitude. It was too intellectually degraded to think out heresies. The literature of the period is generally as gross as it is scanty.

This unquestionably Dark Age ended, about the year 1050, in some renewal of intellectual activity to which the Church, driven by its reformed monks, reacted with the burning of books and their authors. Instead of reproducing, as is customary, the arid catalogue of dates and names, let me give a general explanation. My readers are well aware how by the eleventh century the high culture of the Arabs in Spain had begun to stimulate thought in the nearest province of Christendom, France, but there was another reason. Ireland was, naturally, the last country to suffer from barbaric invaders, and it was therefore the last province of Christendom to retain a (relatively to the age) high culture, including a knowledge of Greek. We must not exaggerate this culture, as it was purely ecclesiastical, but it stimulated at least one Irishman of the ninth century to vital and independent thinking. John Scotus Cri-

gena, which in medieval language means John the Scot (which then applied to Irish and Scots) of Irish Birth, had the misfortune to live in an age that could not recognize genius, but he was the greatest system-maker or original philosopher since the passing of the Greeks. There is no proof that he was either a priest or a monk, as is often said. I need not here examine his semi-Pantheistic philosophy. It is enough that he brought to France and cultivated there the principle that the creed must be made intellectually respectable by the use of reason by bringing it into harmony with a general philosophy of nature.

John's chief book, "On the Division of Nature," started a rationalistic current in France before the influence of the Moors was felt. The bishops of the time were either too sensual to trouble about shades of heresy or too pious to be able to understand subtle philosophies, and the book escaped condemnation for several centuries. Its influence, though by this time the Moorish civilization in Spain was two centuries old and we cannot separate the influences, was first made public in the heresies of Berenger of Tours, the finest scholar and teacher of his age—say, about 1040 to 1080—and an ascetic and religious man. I need note only that he warmly advocated the rights of reason and, though he was summoned to Rome and compelled to burn one of his writings, he triumphantly fought his critics for thirty years.

Thus the way was prepared in France for the brilliant Abélard who, until he was mutilated and sobered, carried the championship of reason to the verge of skepticism. I have shown in my study of his life and times that by the year 1100 France was displaying a very notable intellectual activity, and independent non-clerical teachers and thinkers appeared on all sides. It was a strange and stirring case—the age of chivalry and sexual candor of the rebirth of art, of generally licentious monasteries and nunneries, of ignorant and worldly noble-prelates—and the redevelopment of civilization in Europe would have proceeded rapidly but for the truculent reaction of the Popes. For the second time the stifling of debate was to interfere with the course of civilization. The Popes, it is true, were neither intellectual nor learned enough to follow with interest these new phenomena in the cities of France, but there arose just at this time one of those fanatical monks, Bernard of Clairvaux, who found a prodigious nervous strength in their ecstasies and a sanction of their unprincipled intrigues in their zeal. The truists of papal policy gave Bernard of Clairvaux the power to dictate even to the Papacy, and Abélard was condemned and ruined. To talk of a people needing protection against heretics is absurd. All the youth of France, even many women—for they had begun to have their colleges—joyously followed Abélard, while the crowd of prelates and nobles, even the Papal Legates and monks, who looked on while he was compelled to burn his book in the cathedral of Soissons were as ignorant as they were selfish.

It is a sufficient answer to the new historians who find that there were two renaissances in Germany before this time that for three centuries this first intellectual revival of Europe was confined to France or to men who had been trained at Paris, and all acts of censorship occur there. The only apparent exception is the hanging of the Italian cleric,

Arnold of Brescia, at Rome. But Arnold had been a student of Abélard in France, and, although the Popes covered this murder of him with the pretext of heresy, he was merely so genuine a follower of Christ that he protested against the acquisition of wealth and political power which was ruining the Church. The real line of development continued in France, where from time to time some influential teacher was brought before the synods for advocating its rights of reason and stumbling into some heresy or other in the application of it to the faith. Gilbert de la Porrée, for instance, bishop of Poitiers and one of the most brilliant successors of Abélard in the Paris school, though a man of ascetic habits and very religious, was condemned at Rheims in 1148 for attempting to rationalize the doctrine of the Trinity. In the next generation Amaury of Chartres again restored the prestige of the Paris chair of dialectics. He adopted and developed the system of Scotus Crigena and attained a position much like that of Springer and the Greek Pantheists. Five years after his death his putrefying remains were removed from consecrated ground, as a synod at Paris (1209) had just discovered that he had been a heretic, and thrown away.


Most of the so-called heretics of France had hitherto been men who had not dreamed of challenging the teaching of the Church, but there seems at this time to have been a considerable development of Pantheism. A number of followers of Amaury were burned at the stake, and the burning of books became more frequent. Other currents of heresy were setting in from Spain, Sicily, and the east, and Rome took alarm. The Lateran Council of the year 1215 condemned the works of the French Pantheists, as well as the mystic works of the Abbot Joachim. Ten years later a French synod condemned the work of Scotus Crigena as the source of all the evil, and Pope Honorius confirmed the censure and ordered that throughout Christendom all copies of the work of Crigena should be handed to the clerical authorities and burned. Meantime there spread also over Europe the streams of the brown-robed sons of Francis of Assisi and the white-robed followers of Dominic, and the next notable condemnation of a book reminds us how the Church used these to oust the rationalizing teachers from the universities and establish the orthodox Scholastic philosophy and theology. About the middle of the century we read of the condemnation of a book entitled "The Perils of Our Times," by a Parisian scholar, Guillaume de St. Amour. There is a remarkable and little known page of history behind that bold notification of writers on the Index. St. Amour was the leading representative of the university in its struggle against the invasion of the monks, and it was as such that Rome condemned him. University teaching was taken from the men who had been able to secure some measure of freedom under bishop-nobles who were generally incapable of judging their subtleties, and it was entrusted to the severely organized and docile monks of the two new orders.

The successors of Abélard in France made a more spirited struggle than is generally supposed. As late as 1276 the French bishops condemned two hundred and nineteen propositions which were discussed and maintained in the schools of Paris. The monks were ousting their opponents by sending spies into their classrooms and finding the taint

of heresy in their words. This was the last phase of the first reaction of the Church to the awakening of Europe. The Popes had meantime discovered that it was futile to hope to suppress heresy by allowing the bishops to wait until someone denounced a heretic to them. Europe was ablaze with heresy. A new version of Manicheism, which is familiar to us from its adoption by the Albigensians in the south of France, had spread across the continent from Bulgaria to the Pyrenees and counted its hundreds of thousands of adherents. From Sicily the skepticism of the Arabs had spread to the cities of north Italy, and a very high proportion of the new middle class and aristocracy embraced it. For the first time in Christian history an obviously skeptical prince, Frederic II, set an imperial example of liberty of conduct and defiance of the Papacy. And in every country were large and growing bodies of men and women who regarded the corruption of the Church itself as the cause of the general corruption of life and demanded a return to pure evangelical Christianity. But I have shown in earlier works how this thirteenth century, which many are pleased to represent as an age of almost universal and profoundly submissive piety, because it built beautiful cathedrals, opened with a colossal rebellion against the Popes and their teaching and a general liberty of sexual conduct, and how the Popes, leaving morals unaltered, fell upon the intellectual revolt with bloody crusaders and the establishment of the Inquisition. Dr. Putnam unfortunately supports the hollow modern pretense that "the people and princes moved against the heretics" by saying that Frederic II was "a merciless persecutor." He was persecuted for heresy. He found Popes inviting other princes to invade his empire and seize his throne, and, to stop their intrigues, he was forced to obey them to the extent of enacting a death-penalty for heresy. He never inflicted it, but the Popes compelled other princes to adopt it, and soon the heretics as well as their books were burning in all parts of Europe.

CHAPTER II

FROM CENSORSHIP TO INDEX

E begin to understand why there were no Indexes or lists of prohibited books in the Roman Church until the middle of the sixteenth century. It was not in the least because there were no heretics or because there was no printing press to multiply copies of their writings. It was because the heretic was until the sixteenth century under the hand of the Pope or his local representative and could be exterminated. That was a sufficient indication to the faithful that the possession of his writings would, if reported to the Inquisition by some greedy or malicious neighbor, mean imprisonment and perhaps death. The Index began as, in the main, a list of books published in alien lands by men whom the Papacy could not reach. All that it could do was to punish the people who read imported copies of the books. Hence it is that, as I said, condemnations were not more numerous in

the century after the invention of printing than in the fourteenth century: which is another illustration of the continuousness of the revolt against Rome from the time when Europe was reawakened to some intellectual life. But again a short chapter will suffice to cover the two and a half centuries before the Reformation, as I have so fully described the general features of the period in earlier works.

Let us first set aside the mockery of the pretense that the Church was just as much concerned about writings which corrupted morals as about writing which made rebels against its authority. From the religious point of view it ought to be, for on the Church's principles a work which led to unchastity was just as deadly as a work which led to heresy. The plea of the Church in its censorships was that protected its members from the danger of damnation, and, while the idea of damnation for honest opinions is a crude superstition, there was no ambiguity in the Church code about the penalty of unchastity. If any "protection" was needed, the censorship ought to have been particularly vigilant as regards "immoral" writings. We see very clearly how in this whole business the Church was overwhelmingly concerned about its own interests when we learn that it condemned hardly one of the innumerable loose writings of this extremely loose period, but fell upon the least trace of heresy with inhuman severity. One cannot help reflecting that the obvious difference is that immorality did not detach a man from clerical allegiance and support, whereas heresy did.

Dr. Putnam, who gives us all that has been discovered by earlier writers, can find only one instance before the invention of printing of the censure of a book as "against good morals." This is the *Sachsenspiegel*, which was condemned by Pope Gregory XI in 1374. Dr. Putnam does not reflect how singular it is that this only condemnation of a book as immoral emanates from the papal court at Avignon, which was notorious (though Gregory was not) for its sexual corruption and luxury. All Europe was just at that time cursing it for its vices and greed. Nor does the writer explain that the *Sachsenspiegel* is not, as you might imagine, a collection of troubadour poems or naughty tales, but just the code of laws of the Saxons. In short, the "immorality" is a pretense. It infringed the Pope's rights. And this is the only work in all the loose literature of the Middle Ages against which the Papacy felt it necessary to protect the morals of its innocent children. We shall not find it much more zealous in this respect after the invention of printing. Dr. Putnam makes no comment but continues to say that the Censorship of the Church of Rome is a wise and reasonable institution for the suppression of books against faith or morals.

The works which were condemned for heretical tendencies before the invention of printing may be divided into two classes. In the first class are works of a scientific or intellectual character, and we naturally find very few of these coming under the notice of the new Inquisition. The attempt in the preceding century to introduce the science of the Arabs, either from Spain (through Roger Bacon and the Oxford school) or from Sicily (through Frederic II), had been defeated by the Church. Bacon had been extinguished by confinement in a monastery, Albert the Great by clerical promotion. Astrologers and alchemists only, the feeblest

products of Arab science, continued to flourish in the fourteenth century, for princes and his bishops, and often Popes, were quite willing to patronize men who could forecast their perils and the plots against them and professed to be able to make gold for them.

But whenever these men incautiously went on to a larger study of science and philosophy, the clerical man fell mercilessly upon them. Such was Arnold of Villanueva, a Spanish physician whose extensive scientific knowledge was plainly derived from the Moors and the court of Frederic II, where he was for a time protected from his persecutors. In 1316 the Spanish Inquisition, at Tarragona, condemned twelve of his treatises to be burned. His heresy really was that he was so sincere a Christian that he wanted the Church to return to the poverty and spirituality of Christ. Only a few years earlier an ecclesiastical court had found the Pope, Boniface VIII, guilty of radical skepticism, incest, simony, and murder.

More pitiful was the fate of Cecco of Ascoli, professor of astrology at Bologna University and the real successor of Roger Bacon. The Roman Inquisition in 1328 found him guilty of heresy or magic, his book "On the Sphere" was burned, and Cecco himself went to the stake. No one has ever discovered what exactly his heresies were, and there is little room to doubt that his plea for the cultivation of science instead of the futilities of the Scholastic system was his real offense. Peter of Abano, a distinguished physician at Padua, was the next zealot for science and the next victim of the Inquisition. He had the good fortune to die before the Inquisitors could deal with him, and the holy men had to be content to dig up his body and burn it.

The next to be put on the black list, the Spanish friar Ramon Lull, was one of the most singular figures of his age. From a student of Arab science and a soldier of quite medieval tastes he became, first an ascetic hermit, then a zealous missionary to the Mohammedans. Modern historians of chemistry are skeptical about his scientific attainments, but it is clear that in presenting Christianity to the Moors he followed their own scientific method, mixed with mysticism, and slighted that of the Schoolmen. As he was a Franciscan friar, the Dominican rivals, who ran the Inquisition, found two hundred heretical propositions in his works, and from the austere solitude of the Avignon palace Pope Gregory XI condemned them. There was an unholy fight over his memory of the rival friars for the next four or five centuries. A Papal Legate in Spain said that the bull of condemnation had been secured under false pretenses and might be disregarded, Dominican monks fiercely defending the censure. Nearly two centuries later Paul IV put Lull on the first Roman Index, and the Spaniards again protested. The Spanish king was induced to intervene, and the second Roman Index omitted Lull's name. So to this day no man knows what were the heresies of the picturesque friar-scientist-missionary to the learned Moors.

Apart from an obscure French friar-chemist, Jean de Raquetaillade, these are the only exercises of the censorship on students of science, or men who attacked the Scholastic method, until the days of Giordano Bruno and Galilei, two centuries later. There were no more men to condemn, for the cultivation of science was too heavily discouraged. Cath-

olic thought was confined by the Inquisitors within the limits of the works of that ornament of their order, Thomas Aquinas, and it wasted itself in innocent if sterile verbiage. It began to appear that the most deadly enemy of the papal system was the New Testament. All the "profound" Schoolmen had accepted without hesitation the very large body of historical forgeries which Rome had produced or adopted from the fifth century to the twelfth, and they thus unanimously admitted a crude and fraudulent version of the history of the papal system which prevented them from asking questions. But from the twelfth century onward genuine pietists began to read the New Testament itself rather than the theological commentators, and they were often profoundly impressed and shocked by the contrast between the biblical story of Jesus and Paul and the elaborate ritual, the pompous hierarchy, and the thirst of the Popes for wealth and power. The long sojourn of the Popes in Avignon (1309-78), the scandalous license and luxury of their court, and the elaborate extension of their fiscal system by the Popes of this period gave a great impulse to the evangelical movement in the fourteenth century, and most of the books condemned belong to this school of thought.

One might almost say that it was the zeal of the puritan Popes of the eleventh century for the celibacy of the clergy that initiated the development. They had to quote the many depreciations of sex in the New Testament and thus drew attention to the actual words of Jesus and Paul. But the rapid growth of a literate body of clergy and of a middle class from this time, as the economic life of Europe recovered, was bound to lead to much reading of the Bible, and here and there readers were inspired to demand a return to what was obviously genuine Christianity. By the year 1200, we saw, there were large bodies of evangelical Christians (Waldensians, Cathari, Patarenes, etc.) in Italy, Switzerland, France and Germany. They were generally started by clerics, who read the Bible in Latin, but the New Testament, or parts of it, were translated for the use of their followers. As long as these men were content to teach that poverty was a high virtue recommended in the gospels, the Church was indifferent to their eccentricities. But they were only too apt to demand that the leaders of the Church also should conform to the teaching, and they thus fell into the damnable category of heretics.

The establishment of the orders of mendicant friars for a time absorbed the pietists of this type, but both orders were corrupted within a single generation, and men tried to set up similar bodies which would be independent of the tainting influence of the hierarchy. This invariably meant that they used candid language about the hierarchy and became interesting to the Inquisition. Thus one of the first acts of censorship we find in the fourteenth century is the condemnation by the Council of Vienna in 1311 of the works of Gherardo Segarelli, and Pope John XXII confirmed the sentence some years later and protected all the members of his Church from these poisonous writings. Segarelli had been prudently burned in 1300, but a pupil had taken the lead of the Apostolic Brethren, as his followers were called, and he led thousands of men and women in north Italy in the practice of virtue and reprobation of vice. Unfortunately he included the sins of the Church in his denunciation. He was tortured, with particular brutality, and burned, and the

Brethren were trodden out by troops. So John XXII very willingly put Segarelli's works on the black list and continued to count his money in Avignon.

Some day a candid scholar will throw light on the question whether the censorship of Rome was really, or to what extent, exercised "honestly, devoutly, and unselfishly" by analyzing the character of the various Popes who used it. John XXII, for instance, was the most zealous and unscrupulous money-grinder of the medieval Papacy. He lived sumptuously, spending \$125,000 a year on his household, began the building of the superb palace at Avignon, showered money on his relatives, and left such wealth to his successor that the saying "Drunk as a Pope" is said to have begun with him. John was very vigilant in protecting his flock from literature of the type of the writings of Segarelli. He condemned the works of the German mystic Eckhart and the work in which the pious Marsiglio of Padua and John of Jaudun appealed for a reform of the Church; and he waged merciless war against the large party of Franciscan friars who fought to restore their order to its primitive purity. He actually, in one of his decrees, pronounced it heresy to say that Christ and his apostles had practiced poverty! The General of the Order, Michael of Cesena, and the English friar William of Ockham, one of the ablest Schoolmen of the time, flung back the charge at the Pope, and he condemned their works and had hundreds of the zealous friars burned at the stake. I may add that a later Pope restored to honor the works he condemned, and that John XXII did in other respects teach heresy; for he knew much more about finances than theology. He had the bones of another Franciscan writer, John Peter of Oliva, dug up and burned in the barbaric medieval manner. In addition he was very keen on condemning works on magic, which was now much more common than it had been in ancient Rome. Historians of the Index would illumine his zeal in this connection if they informed their readers that some of his prelates conspired to put an end to the Pope's life by magical means, in which they all believed.

This appeal to the New Testament against the Church, or for the purification of the Church, which would eventually inspire the Reformation, was next embodied in the immensely large sects of the Lollards in England and the Hussites in Bohemia, but I need not again cover the ground of those national movements. England had not admitted the Inquisition, but the opposition of the Lollards to royal and aristocratic as well as prelatical luxury induced King Richard II to listen to the Pope and perceive that such movements were really heretical. The death penalty for heresy was now (1400) lodged in English law, and the Reformation, which seemed well on its way to capture England, was postponed for a century and a half by the extermination of the Lollards and the condemnation of the works of Wyclif. The corresponding heresy was, in a corresponding manner, suppressed in Bohemia. John Hus was burned, after a scandalous breach of faith, his works condemned, his followers put to the sword, and the Council which burned Hus leniently deposed the Pope for being guilty of, in its own words, "sacrilege, adultery, murder, spoliation, rape, and theft." Yet the ideas continued to haunt the mind of pious folk in the fifteenth century. In the year 1459

Pope Pius II had to condemn the writings of Peacock, Bishop of Chichester, as tainted with Wyclifism, and in the next year to condemn German Hussite works.

A work of Pius II himself was later put on the Index, for he had in earlier years defended the doctrine that Councils were superior to Popes and could depose them for misconduct. It is, however, more interesting, especially as we have now arrived at the era of printing, to recall that no Pope of the time knew better than Pius II the erotic literature of his age. He had in early manhood, as his extant letters show, advocated and enjoyed complete sexual liberty, and he had been a close friend of the quite unrestrained Italian writers of the fifteenth century. I must refer to my "History of Rome" and "History of Morals" for an account of these writers, who in their quarrels freely accused each other of homosexual practices and at times seem to defend them in their works. One of them, Poggio Bracciolini, a Papal secretary, wrote, probably to a large extent (as he hints) in the Papal offices, a collection of salacious stories which long circulated in manuscript and then sold twenty-six editions in print before it was noted for expurgation. Filelpo, whose poems are described by John Addington Symonds as "the most nauseous compositions that coarse spite and filthy fancy ever spawned" was employed and richly paid by Pope Nicholas V. Lorenzo Valla, who scorned the idea of chastity in his essay "On Pleasure," was persecuted only when he attacked the Papacy. Aretino, the best and freest poet of the first half of the sixteenth century, was employed by Leo X and Clement VII (zealots against Luther), and he published, amongst other things, sixteen bold sonnets, boldly illustrated, on the sixteen "obscene" paintings of Giulio Romano (who painted many of the religious frescoes of the Vatican and many superb religious pictures), and very nearly got the cardinal's hat from Julius III. Beccadelli . . .

But it is too long a list, and I must refer to my earlier works for the many Italian writers, some of them cardinals and half of them employed by the Popes, who between 1400 and 1550 wrote poems, stories, and comedies as advanced sexually as you will find in any literature of the world. How many of these hundreds of works—to say nothing of the thousands of such works by less distinguished writers—were condemned? Dr. Putnam says

The most obscene books to be found in any literature escaped the Papal censure, and a man like Aretino, notorious for his ribaldry, could aspire with fair prospects of success to the scarlet of a cardinal.

We, of course, read of a few condemnations. We shall later find a few, very few, of these works put on the Index "until they are corrected." But in nearly every case this is because they so gaily speak of the sins of priests, monks and nuns, and the expurgation consisted in turning these into lay folk. The plain fact is that for two centuries a literature of extreme sexual license circulated in Italy (and elsewhere), and hardly any Pope in that time took any notice of it, except to read and enjoy it. For thirty years comedies of this type were presented in the Vatican. As the condition of the Papal court during the most of this period is notorious,

I am not here stating a new or surprising fact. But it is a fact that ought to be taken into account by those who say that Rome's censorship was based solely upon a devout and unselfish concern for the protection of the faithful from mortal sin.

How few of these works are included in the early Indexes, when they appear, we shall see later. I want to make clear my point that there were no more condemnations of books in the century that followed the invention of printing than in the fourteenth century, and that in both cases the facts quite plainly indicate that the concern of the Church is mainly for itself; not for the souls of men. If we take the year 1460 as, roundly, the beginning of the effective era of printing, we find that during the next sixty years, or until the struggle with Luther had become serious, there were only four or five specific condemnations of books. Most of these were acts of censorship by provincial universities or local Inquisitions, and it is again amusing to notice that the few papal acts of censorship were exercised by such Popes as Alexander VI and Leo X. To suggest that such men were more concerned about preserving their subjects from eternal damnation than about the interest of the Church is a mockery.

Indeed, few of the books condemned did contain any heresy, or at least such plain departure from the dogmas of the Church as would cause the least danger to an orthodox reader. In the Netherlands the Inquisition condemned and burned a magistrate, Hermann of Ryswick, who criticized the Papacy, and in Italy Roselli's treatise *On Monarchy* and Savonarola were condemned. In Germany the *Augenspiegel* of the learned Reuchlin, the greatest Hebrew scholar in Europe, was condemned by the universities but declared orthodox by Pope Leo X. Its chief crime was that it attacked the universities for neglecting the study of Hebrew, but it gave a pretext to the authorities as it pleaded for the study of the Talmud, which Rome had repeatedly condemned. Leo X was rudely disturbed in his coarse pleasures at the Vatican by requests to intervene in the dispute, which would bewilder him, and he replied that he could see no harm in the Hebrew scholar. A later Pope put Reuchlin on the Index. But Leo condemned a certain anonymous work entitled *Letters of Obscure Men* in which a brilliant group of the young German reformers satirized the stuffy and futile erudition of the pedants of the Catholic universities. By this time, however, the revolt was very widespread in Germany, and these young rebels were effectively preparing the way for Luther. The only really heretical writings condemned were those of the Italian philosophers of the Renaissance, the Platonist Pico della Mirandola and the Aristotelian Pomponazzi, who denied the immortality of the soul; and these were read by very few and professed to submit to the Church on this and every other point.

But the apologist will very justly remind us that during this period the Church authorities, local and central, relied on a strict control of the presses to prevent undesirable books from being printed. The presses were very active in Germany and the Netherlands after 1470, and, as the acrid or sarcastic criticism of Rome which would eventually become formal revolt, had already spread widely in these regions, large numbers of small critical writings or pamphlets began to appear. That these were read and

discussed by masses of the peasants and artisans is demonstrably false. Luther's contemptuous language about the peasants when the Peasants' War broke out is in strange contrast to Dr. Putnam's quite arbitrary statement that they were generally educated and better able to discuss points of theology than peasants are in any country today. It was the Lutherans themselves who, after closing the middle-class schools of the Jesuits, opened schools for the workers, yet after all this not more than ten per cent of the population of Germany could read until Frederic the Great established his scheme of education. Outside the towns, and to a great extent in the towns, the controversy was conducted by rival preachers, generally in the grossest and most violent language.

Naturally, however, every man who could read was stimulated by the great novelty of the printed page. It was like the coming of the cinema in modern times or of the magic lantern which preceded it; and in the fifteenth century there were far less rival interests. As the passion of the religious conflict increased, a new interest was found in books, and the printers found ready purchasers in the prosperous medieval German towns for criticisms of the Church and translations of the New Testament on which such criticisms were based. Apart from the commonsense movement, as we might call it, of honest disgust at the sale of indulgences and the general greed and corruption of Rome, there was in Germany a large religious revival of a more serious character long before the time of Luther which found its inspiration in the direct reading of the Bible.

The new invention seemed to the critics and pietists a gift of God: to the orthodox and the agents of Rome a device of the devil. The Catholic universities of the north began to petition the Popes for power to control the printers. This seems to have begun in 1479, when Sixtus IV authorized the University of Cologne to punish the printers of heretical works. There is again a very ironic side to the series of such authorizations in the next twenty years which one does not find noticed in writers on the Index. They give, with erudite thoroughness, the dates and details of all such authorizations issued to universities in the north, and presently in Italy, by the succeeding Popes Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, Alexander VI, Julius II, and Leo X. They do not inform or remind their readers that these are just the Popes who presided over a court of such open and general corruption that it has no parallel in the history of religions. Even the first two of these five Popes, who had outlived the sins of youth, when they obtained the tiara, by their patronage of corrupt relatives and cardinals made Rome a shining example of unrestrained luxury and sexual freedom to the whole world, while the other three cannot be credited with any genuine concern for religion and the souls of men. Alexander was, as Pope, a veritable Don Juan and eventually a murderer; Julius, an ex-paederast and father of a family, was still a hard-drinking, cursing, unscrupulous swashbuckler; Leo was a coarse, frivolous, cynical voluptuary, probably addicted to homosexual vice in the Vatican.

I am assuming that my readers have the earlier works in which I have fully described the situation, though few points in the indictment are now seriously questioned. What interests me here is to show how

very misleading the more learned type of work on the Index is. It tells how in 1479 Sixtus IV (a senile weakling surrounded by corrupt men) piously responded to the petition for power to punish the printers of bad books: how in 1487 Innocent VIII (to whom we may fairly give the same description) unctuously confirmed it and summoned the authorities in all countries to watch: how in 1501 Alexander VI (who was in that very year hiring batches of fifty nude prostitutes to entertain his mistress in the Vatican) severely ordered the prelates of Germany to control the printers and check the output of pernicious literature. How Julius and Leo maintained the work of vigilance. Unless one adds, as I have done, a word about the character of these Popes and of Rome at the time, it looks as if the Papacy really were a watchful and scrupulous guardian of the interests of men. But this is not history. An historian must take account of all the relevant facts, and he will then hardly hesitate to conclude that all these edicts for the control of the press had the single aim of protecting the Papal fiscal system and the voluptuous life of the Papal court from injurious criticism.


The religious revolt culminated in the pontificate of Leo X, and that arch-comedian gave the final and fullest expression to this type of censorship before the Indexes began. He cared only for money—he spent, mainly on jewels and his court, a sum equivalent to at least \$60,000,000 of our money in eight years—and he was utterly unscrupulous in his ways of securing it. In the last year but one of his pontificate, the year 1520, he realized that the stream of gold to Rome was seriously threatened, and he issued bulls and decrees to all countries unctuously deploring this spawn of printed heresies against the pure doctrine of the Church and calling upon kings and prelates and universities to prevent the reading of books “against faith or morals.” (He probably had one of his favorite Cardinal Bibbiena’s immoral comedies performed in the Vatican gardens that night and retired to rest with his pages). Spain, Portugal, France, Venice, Naples, and parts of Germany would not receive or publish his chief Bull, and he showered letters on them. Printers must be fined, their stock burned, their shops closed: people who read Luther or the gay Ulrich and other reformers must be handed to the Inquisition: Spanish and Italian ports must watch the vessels from the north to see that they import none of the pestilence into their innocent lands.

I confess that I am unable to write seriously about the censorship at this stage. If you can imagine the bootleggers getting complete control of Washington and applying a rigorous censorship to all literature that criticized the working of the Volstead Act and advocated the repeal of it, you have a genuine parallel to the action of the Papacy in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. We may grant some of the earlier Popes a sincere belief that in condemning the works of heretics they were saving numbers of men from damnation, though the barbarity of their procedure, the social evil of such repressions do not permit us to admire their sincerity. But there was no such sincerity in Rome from 1490 to 1520. Whether there was later, or at what time the Popes began to be honest and unselfish, we shall inquire presently, but this development of censorship which we have considered in the present chapter has obviously nothing to do with pious sentiments. It is the Roman reaction

to the rapid shrinking of the stream of gold from Germany. The Popes who direct it were incapable of any other sentiments. Instead of our putting a strained or prejudiced interpretation on the facts when we suggest these things, we are simply regarding the established facts of Roman history at this period. We are looking to the character of the Popes, as described even in a Catholic history like that of Dr. L. Pastor and in even single non-Catholic historians, and to the fact that what was on Christian principles really poisonous literature, endangering the salvation of souls—the immense erotic literature of the time—did not give the Vatican the least concern.

CHAPTER III

THE EARLY INDEXES

S it is used in this connection the word Index simply means list, but it is a list of so technical a character that we do well to retain the Latin word. The common fashion of referring to it as the Index Expurgatorius, or Expurgatory Index, is, however, quite wrong. The early Roman Index distinguished between books which were to be suppressed and books which were not to be read until they had been "expurgated," or relieved of certain offensive passages. These were generally Catholic works which were supposed to go astray here and there or works with passages which were considered immoral. For these in the sixteenth century a special Index Expurgatorius was issued in two or three places, but the practice was considered dangerous and was discontinued. Such an Index told Protestants, if they got a copy of it, what passages or concessions to quote from Catholic writers, and they advertised questionable books. Lists of this kind ceased to be published, and the Index became, as it still calls itself, the Index of Prohibited Books.

Such lists became necessary as heretical books grew in number, Dutch and English writers joining with the German in the attack. Stringent orders were, as I said in the last chapter, issued in every country to watch the presses, and soon a license, of which the Imprimatur on the back of the title-page of a Catholic book today is a continuation, had to be obtained by the printer for every work. But there was a very lively demand for the new literature in France, Spain, and Italy. The idea that those countries resented Protestant ideas and clung spontaneously to Rome is preposterously unhistorical. Protestantism would have swept Europe in the sixteenth century if the spread had not been combatted by every measure of violence and suppression. Books were imported from Germany and Holland, and the Inquisitors and bishops had to extend their control to the bookshops. Examiners were appointed for all libraries and bookshops, as well as printing shops, and, as a great trade in smuggling then arose, the wagons on the cross-frontier roads and the shops which reached Catholic ports were rigorously searched. The local authorities often resisted or frustrated the Papal agents, much as local police

often thwart federal prohibition officers today. Thus at Como in north Italy, which was a profitable smuggling center between Italy and south Germany, there was many an incident between the civic authorities and the agents of the Inquisition. The latter one day confiscated twelve bales of heretical books that had come from Germany and ordered that they should be destroyed. The local authorities, looking to the interests of their trade, ordered instead that the books should be sent back to the importers, and there were excommunications and Inquisitors flying for their lives before angry citizens. As I said, the notion that the Latin nations were "naturally Catholic" and resisted the Reform is grossly false. They thirsted for the prohibited books. But behind the federal agents of the Church were such drastic penalties, and the policy of the Church became at times so severe, that prohibition succeeded. Pope Julius III withdrew all existing dispensations to read heretical books, and the scholars who were refuting the Protestants, and even cardinals and princes, had to ask Papal permission and advance adequate reasons.

For the use of this international police which spread its net over the whole of Catholic Europe the Church had to provide lists of heretical books, since the bulk of the agents would know nothing about the German or English writers. There was, in fact, a rivalry of the Franciscan and Dominican monks to control the business, and they roundly accused each other of gross ignorance; and presently the sons of St. Ignatius, the hawks of the religious field, would denounce both as unlettered bunglers and replace them. Short lists began to appear in various Spanish and Italian cities, and a Bernard Lutzenberg of Cologne published a *Catalogue of Heretics* in 1520. Putnam says that "about 1520 Nicholas Eymeric brought into print, in Venice, under the title of *Directorium Inquisitorium*, a list of books classed as heretical." As a matter of fact, this Spanish Dominican friar and Inquisitor General, had died nearly two hundred years before. What he had done was to write a manual for Inquisitors, and this was now republished with Lutzenberg's list of heretics and served as a basis for many other lists. Henry VIII was still "the Defender of the Faith," which had not yet refused him a divorce, and he published lists of German heretics in 1526 and 1529. The second list named eighty-five books which were "imported by adherents of heretical sects." He forbade the reading of the Bible in English and burned the translation of the pious W. Tyndale (which is the basis of the present translation); and the Reformer, a scholarly man of good family, was strangled and burned at Antwerp a few years later. By the latter date the Bible was being pressed upon the English as the one book that mattered, and a copy was chained in every parish church; though it fell into disgrace again under Mary and was again restored to favor under Elizabeth.

But we must devote a special chapter to the fortunes of the Bible under Church censorship, and it is not necessary to tell of all the lists which were drawn up in all parts of Europe. The University of Paris drew up in 1544 a list of a hundred and seventy Protestant works in alphabetical order which some count the first Index, though most authorities give this place to the Index published in 1546 by Louvain University. The Netherlands were still part of Spain's empire, and this meant that, while the nearness to Germany brought a good deal of heretical

literature, the official Catholic resistance was reinforced by the fanaticism of the Spanish authorities; and, on the other hand, the heavy commerce between Spain and Belgium took much of the heretical literature into the former country. The educated part of lay Spain was very far from being fanatically Catholic. The works of Erasmus were the best sellers in Spain until they were put on the Index in 1550. He was considered one of the chief ornaments of the Empire, and, even when the theologians began to scent heresy in his wicked jokes and subtle insinuations, the Spanish laity continued to read him with delight in their Castilian translations. He was not in the list of authors condemned by the doctors of Louvain.

There is, in fact, little sense in speaking of a first Index, as during twenty or thirty years theologians were making lists, and one city borrowed from another. Quite commonly they handled the names with the same ignorant awkwardness with which we handle Chinese names today. Martin Luther became Lutheti, and, while one may regard this as a mere typographical error for Lutheri (of Luther), we must admit an extraordinary ignorance of what was happening in Germany when we find such things as Zironga for Zewingli (one of the most learned of the Reformers). In the Belgian list, which was in the vernacular, the obscure Protestant writer Johann Puffer von Goch was included. Compilers of other Indexes, in Latin, converted him into Johannes Puferis et Gorcianus, Purfurus et Gorcianus, or in Italian, two individuals named Puferio et Gorziano. In the end he becomes three heresiarchs. The much better known heretic Munster is listed as Mustere, while the French writer Nicolas Clemanges, a pious Catholic who had written *On the Corruption of the Church*, passes over Europe as Clemangis or Elemangio. The heretics of Germany reproduced the lists with great joy.

Their delight was still greater when, in 1549, what is called the second Index appeared at Venice. The Pope directed his Nuncio, John della Casa, Archbishop of Benevento, to compose a list for the agents who had to watch the ships and wharves of Venice, as the city never admitted the Roman Inquisition within its boundaries. The archbishop professed to summon the most learned theologians of Venice to his assistance, and a list of a hundred and forty-nine heretical writers was compiled. This list was reproduced in Germany by an Italian named Vergerio; at one time a Catholic bishop and Papal Legate to Germany, who had been converted to Protestantism by the men he was trying to convert. He caustically enumerates the errors which betray the ignorance of the compilers, but he makes a stronger point of the fact that these guardians of the mind of Italy have not included any of the erotic literature to which I have previously referred. Had they conscientiously done this, he says, they would have been compelled to put on their Index a book of poems, one of which was particularly scandalous, by Archbishop della Casa himself. Reusch makes the curious defense that in this "sin of his youth" the archbishop "does not expressly glorify sodomy," and that in any case it is a trifle in comparison with the writings of Cardinal Bembo, an intimate friend of the Pope. Catholic writers generally suggest merely that the archbishop had repented of the sins of his youth, of which it would be difficult to give positive evidence, and that della

Casa retorted that Vergerio was a liar, glutton and seducer, and had murdered his wife in order to get promotion in the Church. We leave all these statements in the air, but it is admitted by all that the compiler of the second Index to protect the faithful did write in earlier years the poem in question, "Capitolo del Forno," and that it certainly did not condemn sodomy.

The Venetian Index was promptly copied and enlarged in other cities of Italy and Spain. The list soon grew to five hundred names. We might be tempted to admire the sensitiveness or the subtlety of the literary inquisitors, but the truth is that this now became, like the work of the Inquisition generally, a profitable business. Not only had a new branch of the ecclesiastical army to be created, but spies and informers shared the heavy fines which were imposed for reading, buying, selling, or printing heretical books. The money was divided between the informers, the inquisitors and the secular authorities who permitted them to work under their jurisdiction. Even a Protestant who recanted and denounced others was rewarded with one-fourth of the penalty exacted. In Spain, where native heretics were scarce, the Koran and Talmud were included, and at Valladolid the list enumerated more than a hundred editions of the Bible which were forbidden until they were corrected. Learned professors had to give up their Hebrew Old Testaments and their German editions of the works of the Fathers, which were better than the Italian. Popular prayer books which provoked the derision of heretics were put on the Index. The works of Erasmus, whom the Emperor had befriended, gave great trouble, as I said, but there was a particular difficulty in connection with his Greek edition of the New Testament. Pope Leo X had very warmly congratulated Erasmus on the work. The printers were instructed to put a marginal note to the Pope's letter to the effect that he had merely chosen this diplomatic way of luring the wandering sheep back to the fold. Erasmus continued for a very long time to baffle and divide the censors.

The Spanish lists included a memoir on the Council of Basle by the man who later became Pope Pius II, and a memoir on the reform of the Church written by Cardinal Caraffa, who now became Pope Paul IV. Historians of the Index, who so easily repeat the Catholic argument that the Papacy was bound at least by its principles to protect its subjects by a stern watch on printed books, never offer their readers any explanation of the fact, which they are careful not to stress, that Rome had no Index until the year 1559, a hundred years after the time of Gutenberg. It was almost the last of the greater Catholic cities to provide a list of prohibited books. England and Belgium, France and Catholic Germany, Spain and north Italy, had been compiling such lists since the outbreak of the Reformation, but Rome had merely condemned the works of two or three of the leading Reformers. My readers will not require an explanation. All the talk about reform in Rome until 1555 is the hollowest of shams. Rome waited for the various Catholic princes to crush the heretics in their dominions and permit it to live on in its luxurious tranquillity. Omitting a few would-be reformers who held the pontificate only for a few months or a few weeks, the time from the death of Leo X to the accession of Paul IV, the most critical thirty years in

- the history of the Church was filled by the reigns of Clement VII, a bastard of the Medici family, a wanton nepotist, and an unscrupulous opportunist; Paul III, the licentious brother of Alexander VI's mistress, a nepotist, and the chief opponent of the Council of Trent which was to reform the Church; and Julius III, a coarse glutton, a patron of indecent comedies in the Vatican, very gravely suspected of homosexual relations with a boy whom he had picked off the streets and made a cardinal. And even then—passing over a three-week Pope—it was only by a mighty effort that the most licentious survivor of the old school of cardinals was prevented from winning his way by heavy bribery to the throne. He was beaten by the stormy Neapolitan reformer, Cardinal Caraffa, and, after three weeks of the unfortunate Pope Marcellus II, Caraffa became Pope Paul IV.

In the last year of his pontificate (not the first, as Putnam says) Paul, seeing the whole Catholic world compiling lists of heretical works, decided to follow the example of the cities he was supposed to lead. He had spent most of his time up to this in such unscrupulous struggle to enrich his numerous relatives that the Catholic Spaniards were compelled to besiege Rome, and the fierce Papal enemy of heretics actually brought Lutheran soldiers, and even appealed to the Sultan of Turkey for Mohammedan troops, to help his own worthless army. It is necessary to recall these undisputed facts when the chief work on the Index represents Paul as a pure-minded idealist who ordered the compilation of an Index as soon as he mounted the throne. Paul was certainly chaste—he was seventy-nine years old—but he was in no other respect ascetic. He spent hours over his elaborate dinner and his fiery wine, and he had the uncontrolled temper of a common soldier. The Romans hated him and, as we shall see, destroyed his work and tried to erase the memory of him as soon as he was dead.

It was in these inauspicious circumstances, after he had discovered the criminality of his relatives and the ruin they brought upon Rome, that Paul ordered his officials to compile an Index for the whole Catholic world. It was said by the Papal officials that the work was done with particular care and thoroughness: that the questionable books stored in the Vatican Library were divided amongst groups of Rome's most learned theologians and carefully examined. But Reusch has no difficulty in showing that the compilers merely tried to make the largest Index in Europe by adding together all the names in all the crude lists that were already available. The list contains the names of about six thousand books or authors. For the most part these names are as unfamiliar to us as if they were the names of contemporary carpenters in the workshops of Rome, and large numbers of them seem to have been just as unfamiliar to the compilers of the list. Quite a number of Catholics are carelessly included, while some important heretics such as Beza are omitted. Scores of men are included who never wrote anything, and many others who may have written on music or some other innocent subject but never on theology.

I have read the Index from end to end, and it is one of the weirdest and most unpractical lists imaginable. All that the compilers seem to have cared for was to have the biggest Index in Christendom. The Legend of

King Arthur has by some curious freak given them the name of an English heretic whom they call "Arturus Britannus"; and we shall see that in the second Roman Index, when the learned Council of Trent has had time to consider the matter, the name becomes "[Thomas] Arturus Britannus," or "the Englishman Thomas Arthur." The wizard Merlin also is there. The names of genuine English writers are given as Ochan (William G. Ockham), Taylous (Taylor), Foxus (Fox), Rochors (Rogers—in other versions Rochus), and so on. Writers of other nations are treated in much the same way, but even when the actual book was before the compilers the treatment was often stupid. Thus a German Dominican monk, John Host, actually a zealous Inquisitor, had written a book entitled (in Latin) "The Proper Ministry of the Word of God," and so he is put on the Index as a Protestant. Another amusing line is "Commentaria Germ, in Cornelium Tacitum." This quite plainly means "German Commentaries on Tacitus" and betrays gross ignorance. Dante's prose treatise "On Monarchy" is included, and every work criticizing the corruption of the Church or the clergy, of which the Vatican Library seems to have had a fine collection, is forbidden. But there is still no censorship of the immense erotic literature, for the few such works mentioned are obviously held up because they describe the looseness of bishops, monks and nuns.

The Index was joyously reprinted in Protestant Germany with scornful comments on its ignorance, and there was much anger in the Italian cities in which the Pope more or less succeeded in getting it enforced. Sixty-one European printers were named, and a Catholic who had any book published by one of them must give it up to be burned. There was a long list of editions of the Bible which must be surrendered. Letters of contemporary scholars express great anger and concern for their libraries, which, in Rome at least, the Pope's agents might enter at any time. "There was," says one contemporary, "such a burning of books that one is reminded of the burning of Troy." But there was less damage done than one might expect. France and Spain, and even Venice, Naples and Milan, refused to receive the Pope's guidance and said that they would attend to such matters themselves. The civic authorities at Florence begged the Grand Duke to ignore it, saying that it would mean the destruction of a quarter of a million dollars worth of property and ruin the printers and booksellers: which again shows how Italians welcomed the Reform literature. The Grand Duke, under heavy pressure from Rome, had to consent to the burning of books which attacked the faith or defended magic or astrology; but he prevented even the Dominican monks of San Marco from going further. Outside of Italy the decree could be enforced only in a few cities like Avignon.

But even in Italy the vandals had little time for their work. Paul became dangerously ill in the year in which he published the Index, and before he died the Romans rose, attacked and wrecked the Palace of the Inquisition, wounded the defending monks, and released seventy-two heretics from the dungeons. Dr. Ludwig Pastor, the Catholic historian, who says that it would be useless today to attempt to excuse "the grave faults" of Paul IV (the first reform-Pope), tells us that the dying Pope summoned the general of the Jesuits and said to him:

My relatives plunged me into an unhappy war from which many sins in the Church of God have arisen. Since the time of St. Peter there has been no such unhappy pontificate in the Church. I repent bitterly of what has happened.

The Vatican officials had to bury him secretly by night and set a guard over his grave, or the Romans would have desecrated his corpse. As it was they annihilated his family and tore down the Caraffa arms everywhere, and they dragged statues of the Pope derisively through the streets and threw them into the river. Such was the hatred of Paul's attempts at "reform" that a Jew was suffered to put his yellow cap in mockery on the head of Paul's statue. The Index was dismissed as a piece of ignorance and folly.

The Papacy fell back into the charge of a man, Pius IV, who had no personal inclination to reform and seemed disposed to live in the old spirit as far as the diminished revenues permitted. But the countries which were still Catholic threatened to break the connection with Rome and set up national Churches unless some effort was made to meet the taunts of Protestants by convoking the long-delayed Council of Trent which was to reform the Church in doctrine and morals. I have elsewhere explained how Rome resisted the demand of the Church for this reform-Council for more than twenty years, and how, when the French at last threatened to have the election of Pius IV declared invalid for simony (of which he was guilty), forced him to summon the Council, he and the Jesuits almost confined its work to the formulation of doctrines by which heretics could be judged and condemned. As part of this work the Council set about the compilation of a new Index to supersede the clumsy list of Paul IV.

But the new Index was little better than the old. Quite early in the proceedings of the Council a special commission, including four archbishops and nine bishops, was appointed to rectify Paul's Index. They had neither the books nor the knowledge of books that were required, and there was no agreement even as to the desirability of the work. We find the Archbishop of Prague writing to the German Emperor to send learned theologians to assist them, "as there are few here who know anything about the heresies and ways of the Germans." We find the Spanish ambassador, Count de Luna, writing to Philip II that he is doing his best to see that the commission comes to no conclusion. The whole story of intrigues and violent quarrels is as far removed from the pretty Catholic picture of Spirit-directed and zealous prelates as one can imagine. By the time when the commission on the Index had blundered through its work and was prepared to report to the general assembly, all were tired and disgusted, and Rome pressed heavily for a conclusion on the ground that the Pope was dangerously ill. The final sessions were so scandalously hurried that the ambassadors of the Catholic powers refused to sign the decrees, as was intended. The French bishops on their return spread so derisive a report of the proceedings that it became a common joke that the Council of Trent was greater than the meeting of the Apostles since the latter were restrained by the Holy Ghost while the prelates at Trent did what they pleased. The German princes, the Em-

peror and the Duke of Bavaria, expressed to Rome their profound disgust that the Council had not had courage to denounce the sale of indulgences which Spain, Portugal and the Vatican found still very profitable. Spain complained of the haste required when the Pope fell ill—he had promptly recovered—and the Romans pressed the Pope to repudiate the whole Council and its conclusions.

Such is the real story of the Council which so many historians are now persuaded by Catholics to treat with unctuous respect. In the circumstances we should at least expect this clotted assembly of such scholarship as there was in the Italian and Spanish Churches to correct the stupidities of the Index of Paul IV, but the improvement is slight. The list of names as a whole is antiquated and barbarous. Mr. Thomas Arthur of Britain still masquerades in it, and there are still scores of men named as authors who never wrote books. During the Council a protest was sent from Germany with thirty-four Protestant signatures. They were all put on the Index, though only eleven of them had ever written anything. Reusch observes, after a lengthy analysis, that the compilers evidently did not give much time to revising Paul's list. As the Council was supposed to be equally concerned about morals and faith, a beginning has to be made of moral censorship, but the very few names are generally those of men who, as I said, tell naughty stories about monks and nuns. They are to be "expurgated." On the other hand, all the works of Macchiavelli (who merely codified the behavior of Popes and princes in his time) and the history of Guicciardini, the best yet produced in Europe, are condemned. The works of Erasmus again gave the censors a thorny problem. The Archbishop of Prague threatened to resign in protest against the ignorance of the Spanish and Italian censors, and it was agreed to put only certain works of Erasmus on the Index. Later Pope Sixtus V would angrily put them all on, but real scholars compelled the Popes to return to the position of Trent.


The most important part of the decree in which Pius IV promulgated the Index of Trent in 1564 was a series of ten general rules which were prefixed to the list of names. The most significant of these forbids the reading of translations of the Bible, but we will consider Rome's attitude toward the Bible in a separate chapter. The other rules urge Catholic authorities all over the world to make the censorship of books more drastic than ever. The bishops and Inquisitors are to watch every bookshop, and the bookseller is to keep for them a list of the books he sells. Special vigilance is required in the case of imported books, and the heir to any property which includes books must furnish a list of them to the ecclesiastical authorities. Once more Catholic cities had a network of spies, and the most drastic precautions were taken to prevent Catholics from knowing the historical truth about their Church and the causes of the Reformation. How, under shelter of this intellectual tariff-wall, Catholic writers became almost bolder than ever we shall see in the next chapter.

As this Index had been compiled by a Council that represented the whole Church, it was more widely accepted than its predecessor, at least in Italy. Spain refused to receive it, though the Pope insisted that it was binding everywhere without formal acceptance, and continued to

make its own Indexes, as we shall see later. In France a few provincial synods accepted and enforced the Index, but neither the French Church as a whole, nor the King, nor the Paris Parliament recognized it. Only Belgium, Portugal, and Bavaria obeyed the Pope and accepted his decree. On the other hand, all the cities of north Italy accepted it. German printers sent secret agents to inflame the patriotic feeling of Venice, which was generally hostile to Papal interference, but they failed and their profitable trade was ruined. Italian professors complained that, not only the works of the heretics whom they had to refute, but translations of the Bible, valuable editions of the Fathers from the northern presses, and even such Italian classics as Dante, Guicciardini, and Macchiavelli, were destroyed. The standard of literature in Catholic countries rapidly degenerated. Printers had to take oaths of loyalty to the Church before they were licensed to open shops, and muddle-headed censors everywhere hampered the circulation of any but the most fatuously orthodox books. But we will carry a step further the story of the Vatican and the Index before we study the consequences in the Catholic world generally.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX

 EVEN years after the publication of the list of condemned books which had been compiled by the Council of Trent, the Papacy completed its machinery for concealing the truth from Catholics by creating the Congregation of the Index. As is well known, the business of the Vatican is divided amongst a large number of these Congregations, or specialized bureaus, in which a few cardinals, with a staff of clerical assistants, discharge the routine duties and prepare the material of important decisions for the Pope. Pius V, in 1571, created the Congregation of the Index, with four (later raised to seven) cardinals at its head, to see to the enforcement of the list, condemn new works as they appeared, and receive consultation from the provinces. It is often described as a piece of statesmanship on the part of Pope Sixtus V that he, a few years later, established fifteen of these Congregations and divided the work of the Church amongst them. A careful inquirer would discover that contemporary Rome took a different view of the Pope's action. Sixtus was a harsh and violent autocrat who would not tolerate the slightest opposition. Hence instead of submitting all important questions to his cardinals in council, as had been the custom, he split them into small groups for special purposes and left them no real initiative.

The Congregation of the Index at least was a necessary institution, if the output of literature of the entire Catholic world was to be watched, but before we study its action in detail it will be useful to consider a few broad aspects of the new censorship and the supposed general reform of the Church. I have in my *History of the Roman Church* shown that what is called the Catholic or Counter-Reformation is largely fictitious,

but writers on the Index so lightly take it as part of a real and comprehensive purification of the medieval Church that a few words may be added here. Dr. Putnam goes so far as to wonder whether Luther would ever have nailed his theses to the church-door at Wittenberg if the reforms which were initiated at Trent and enforced by the Popes had been made fifty years earlier. One again sees the disadvantage to scholars of this new attitude toward Rome. Luther's challenge mainly referred to the seal of indulgences and the whole theological doctrine of the indulgence, as all must know. But the Council of Trent not only did not alter a line of the Church's doctrine of indulgences, which was the chief rock of offense to Protestants, but it, and the Papacy, expressly refused to condemn the sale of indulgences—to avoid quibbles, let us say the taking of money for indulgences—when the German prelates at the Council demanded this condemnation. We read in the history of the Council that the Spanish and Portuguese representatives warmly opposed the idea of suppressing money-payments in connection with indulgences, and the question was at once dismissed; and we shall presently find the "reform Popes" expressly confirming the sale in Spain and extending it to Spanish America, to their own considerable profit.

There are the same serious historical errors in all the new language about the Vatican in the sixteenth century. Catholics must have quoted many times this remarkable passage from Dr. Putnam's "History of the Censorship" (I, 205), which I overlooked in writing my History of the Church:

The history of the succeeding century [after Trent] makes clear that the Catholic reformation was undertaken in good faith, and with a full measure of devotion and earnestness, and that it brought about a great revival in Christian spirit and a noteworthy advance in scholarship, in wisdom and administration, and in faithful service on the part of rulers, and of zeal, faith, and good works among their flocks . . . Paul IV, Pius IV, Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V led austere lives and insisted that their courtiers should accept the same standard of life . . . Nepotism is prohibited: the cardinals are brought back to a modest and consistent way of living: the bishops are sent back to their diocese: the monks return to their convents.

My friend probably thought that in this he was gently rebuking my own illiberal and one-sided attitude, as he called it, toward the Church of Rome, yet nearly every line of this passage is strictly opposed to the historical facts; and the passage is followed by several equally unhistorical pages on the "wholesome influence on Italian and Spanish literature" of the Index and the way in which French literature now "received from Christianity its most profound impression." It may be useful to the reader if I here bring together the relevant historical facts, undisputed facts, which I give, with the proper authorities, in my Key to Culture (literary section), History of the Roman Church, and History of Morals. I need not again show that some measure of reform was forced upon the Vatican, which resisted as long as possible, if it were not to lose Austria, Bavaria and France as well as Germany and England; that some

of the grossest abuses (sale of indulgences, etc.) were preserved in Spain, Portugal, Naples and Spanish America, where few heretics would see them; and that, apart from the abandonment of the quite open and flaunting gaiety of the earlier Papal court (largely from lack of funds), there was no permanent alteration of the morals of priests, monks and nuns. I may here confine myself to two points, and they are material to our inquiry: the real character of these reform-Popes who put blinkers on the Catholic world by their drastic censorship, and the effect of this on Catholic literature and scholarship.

The character of the first of these Popes, Paul IV, I have already described, and it is not disputed. His only "virtue" was that he was a ferocious puritan. Perhaps the severest comment on the passage I quoted above is that, instead of abolishing nepotism, which was one of the greatest curses of the Renaissance Papacy, every single one of Dr. Putnam's model Popes was a nepotist, and the saintly Paul IV was the worst of them all! Paul was succeeded by Pius IV (1559-65), who controlled the Council of Trent. Pastor admits that he was not only a nepotist but a man "little imbued with the ecclesiastical spirit" (the Pope of the Council of Trent and the Index!) and "personally inclined to a more secular course of action." To put this Catholic language into plainer English, Pius IV was a Pope of the old Renaissance type, who detested work and asceticism and reform, and he sacrificed no more of the old order than he could possibly avoid. His short pontificate was nearly brought to a close by the poisoned daggers of conspirators, and, though Pastor feebly denies this, there is strong reason to believe that the puritans sought his life precisely because he would not reform the Church and abandon his pleasures.

Pius V (1566-72) was one of the two real reform Popes. He found Rome, half a century after Luther's outbreak, as openly immoral as ever, the higher prostitutes entertaining prelates and making incomes (chiefly from clerics) of fifty to a hundred thousand dollars a year. I have elsewhere described his picturesque campaign to reform the morals of the clergy, monks, and laity, which resulted in such increase of crime and sodomy that the Pope himself wearied of it in a few years. He promoted his nephew, and he confirmed the seal of indulgences in Spain on condition that the Vatican got a larger share of the proceeds. His successor, Gregory XIII, who had been a notoriously immoral cardinal, extended the sale of indulgences to America and so far relaxed the puritanical pressure, in spite of Jesuits and zealots, that one famous courtesan made three quarters of a million dollars in Rome during his pontificate. To include him and Pius IV in a list of men who led "austere lives" is comical. The austerity began again under his successor, Sixtus V (1585-90), a Franciscan monk, who fell upon vice and heresy with fiery and truculent energy. He executed thousands, including renegade monks and mothers who, when the Popes banished whores from Rome, hired out their daughters. The decrees of Sixtus, which the Catholic Baron Hübner describes in his life of the Pope, show that twenty years after the Council of Trent sexual freedom and crime were just as great as ever in Italy. And Baron Hübner admits that this ferocious zealot for chastity (aged sixty-four) had got the Papacy by intrigue

and bribery, was a disgraceful and unrestrained nepotist (promoting a nephew of thirteen to the cardinalate), had the temper of a tiger, sold clerical honors and offices quite scandalously, and was altogether unscrupulous in his zeal for money.

Such is the historical truth about the Popes who fastened the censorship on the Church of Rome. Now for a word about the consequences. To speak of a literary revival in Italy and Spain is astounding. In both countries literature and art sank into complete decay. From Dante to Trent Italy had had a magnificent literature. After Trent almost the only writers mentioned are men whom the Church murdered (Bruno and Vanini) or scientific men (Galilei, etc.) whom the Church certainly did not inspire. There is almost a blank in Italian literary history until Deists like Alfieri, Foscolo, and Leopardi restore the standard in spite of the Church. Dr. Putnam justifies what he calls the "noteworthy advance in scholarship" by quoting the names of Baronius and Bellarmine. No one now reads either, and, as I will show presently, they both took advantage of the censorship to impose forgeries on their "protected" readers.

There is no need to speak of literature in Spain. After the seventeenth century there were "two centuries of comparative silence," says one of the chief historians. As to the profoundly Catholic literature of France in the seventeenth century, one would like to ask Dr. Putnam to explain how he finds this is the wickedest age of French history, the time of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. As a matter of fact, of the five major poets and dramatists, Racine, Corneille, Boileau, Molière and Cyrano de Bergerac, only the first two were Catholics, and their inspiration was almost purely classical. Of the leading prose writers, Descartes, Pascal, and Bayle, the third was a skeptic, and the other two were persecuted by the Church and put on the Index. The only literature that Dr. Putnam could quote in extenuation of his unfortunate statement is a group of eloquent (and sometimes not edifying) preachers, a few clerical scholars of great learning and liberality, and the Jansenist group which reacted from the general license of the time.

The kind of scholarship which now developed in Rome under the shelter of the Congregation of the Index is well illustrated by a story that is recorded of Sixtus V. The Pope was, from the Catholic viewpoint, a quite learned man, and he decided to correct with his own hand the new edition of the Latin Bible which he proposed to publish. It was printed and ready to be issued when a copy reached Cardinal Bellarmine. The learned cardinal found that it had two thousand errors, and he persuaded the Pope to withdraw it and announce that there were certain typographical errors which had been overlooked. But the fiery old autocrat had his revenge. On the new Index which he ordered he put, against the wishes of the Congregation of the Index, a theological work of Bellarmine, the glory of the Jesuit Society. Putnam finds it mysterious that the leading defender of orthodoxy should be put on the Index. It is simple. Sixtus, being a good Franciscan, mortally hated these sons of St. Ignatius who were pushing the older monastic bodies into the background; and Bellarmine was, as I said, a Jesuit. It is almost certain that the Pope would, if he had lived another year, have suppressed the

Society, and the rumor was current in Rome that the Jesuits poisoned him. It is credibly reported that Bellarmine, in telling someone of the death of the Pope, said that he had "gone to hell."

The new Index which Sixtus produced was so much worse than its predecessors that it had to be withdrawn after his death. With his usual harsh dogmatism the Pope announced it to the world, in his opening decree, as the one perfect Index which must supersede all others. His language is atrociously arrogant, and his threats are sulphurous. People who read books on the new and greatly extended list incur excommunication from which, except in the case of the dying, the Pope alone can absolve. All local lists and rules in the various provinces of the Church are to be abandoned. All permits to read forbidden books for the purpose of refuting them, even if given to professors, cardinals, or princes, are withdrawn, and new permits can be obtained of the Vatican only. Books may henceforward be printed only in towns where there is a resident Inquisitor. Men are not to be trusted to burn heretical books that come into their possession. They must be given to the authorities. The list of names that followed corrected few errors of the earlier lists and added many. Several English heretics appear, and amongst them is a mysterious Anna A. Skene, who in a later Index reappears as A. S. Kenne. These wonderful new Roman scholars had somehow learned of Anne Askew, an early Protestant who had been vilely tortured and burned in London nearly half a century earlier. She had never written anything. Sixtus died a few weeks after the publication of his Index, and the Vatican was so ashamed of it that it tried to recall every copy and suppress it; but the German Protestants had got a copy and published it with the customary mirth. The new Pope serenely announced that Sixtus had died "before completing his work."

The new Index, which Clement VIII published in 1596, had the advantage of the highest scholarship that Rome afforded. Cardinal Bellarmine had the chief sphere in compiling it, and Cardinal Baronius, who belonged to a rival congregation, very willingly undertook to criticize it. Many other theologians cooperated. There was, however, little real improvement. The list as a whole remained a musty collection of names of men whose works, if they had written any—many had not—must have been quite unobtainable in the year 1596. But we begin to notice a new departure in the Indexes. The censors are looking more for dubious passages in Catholic writers and leaving foreign heretics to be kept out by the agents of the Index or the Inquisition. There is also more show of concern about morals, though books of this type are still lost in the crowd of forgotten heretics; and there is a repeated warning against translations of the Bible and foreign editions of the works of the Fathers. It seems that these shameless heretics were falsifying the text of the Bible and the Fathers to support their horrid doctrines.

The heretics, of course, retorted that it was these protected writers of the new Papacy who adulterated texts to suit their purposes, and, as one would expect, their complete immunity from criticism made them quite audacious in the use of Rome's rich collection of fiction and forgeries. Writers on the Index who find such suggestions indelicate do not study the facts. Under Sixtus V, for instance, a new edition of the

Breviary was prepared, and the learned Baronius and Bellarmine were chiefly responsible. This prayer-book of the priests, as one might call it, includes short lives of the saints, and a comparison of the new Breviary with its predecessors reveals that it contains more Pope-Saints than even the Middle Ages had dared to claim. Until 1580 the Church had claimed only four Popes who were saints in the first three centuries. The number increases miraculously in the new Breviary. Another ritual work, of which Baronius had to prepare a new edition, was the Martyrology or book of the martyrs. In this also disgraceful new forgeries were inserted in the interest of the Papacy. In notices of bishop-martyrs who were honored in France, for instance, Baronius inserts the mendacious statement that the Popes had sent them to the country. The national patron, St. Denis, had hitherto passed in Catholic literature as belonging to the second half of the third century. Baronius makes Pope Clement, of the first century, authorize him to go to France.

I have in some of my works quoted with approval the very voluminous History of the Church which is the chief work of Baronius. It is certainly very frank about what it calls the Rule of the Whores at Rome in the tenth century, but it is quite scandalously fictional in dealing with the first few centuries, so as to conceal the rejection of the Papal claim by every branch of the Christian Church outside Rome. The cardinal was clearly acting on his knowledge that his Catholic readers would never see the Protestant works in which his fictions were exposed. Both he and Bellarmine make free use of the False Decretals in support of the Papal authority, whereas this spuriousness, which is now admitted by the Church, had been proved long before, and there is evidence that Cardinal Bellarmine recognized it. Probably both scholars were fully aware of it. Other Jesuit writers of the time joined in the good work. One wrote a defense of the False Decretals in which he used other forged evidence. A Spanish writer was made a cardinal for defending the shameless fabrication. Another Jesuit published a falsified study of the Council of Nicaea to give spurious support to the Papal authority.

One often now reads complimentary references to the system of schools and colleges which the Jesuits established in every part of the Catholic world. Since it is a notorious fact that Catholic countries retained the highest percentage of illiterates in Europe in the early part of the nineteenth century, one is surprised to find responsible writers reproducing such reflections. The Jesuit schools were mainly established for the education of youths of the middle and noble class in the fictitious version of Papal history which I have described. On the other hand, it is amusing to find that while the Papacy's Jesuit agents were thus using forgery to a scandalous extent, the documents issued by the Congregation of the Index were full of complaints that the heretics were such shameless forgers that even their translations of the Bible and German editions of the works of the Fathers must be avoided under suspicion of heresy. I cannot discover any historian who has made what ought to be a very interesting investigation of this point and compared text by text the Protestant and Catholic versions of the Bible and the Fathers at this period. It is quite clear from the stern efforts of the Catholic authorities to exclude Protestant editions that there were serious varia-

tions of the text, and that therefore one side or both deliberately tampered with it. As there was a corresponding censorship, though of a looser and less drastic nature, in Protestant lands, we may suspect that writers on both sides used their privileged position to deceive their readers. Every weapon was considered lawful in that holy war.

As the forgeries and misrepresentations increased, it became more and more difficult even for Catholic scholars to get permission to consult the prohibited books from which they could learn the truth. Five times in half a century Rome cancelled all permits to scholars to read heretical books, even if they had been granted by Inquisitors or bishops. During most of this period such a permit could be obtained only from the Congregation of the Index, and the correspondence of the time is full of complaints of the stupidity, indolence, or arbitrariness of the crowd of monks who ran the bureau. In 1584 a chaplain of Philip II of Spain writes to Cardinal Sirleto, the head of the Vatican Library:

The Pope has appointed as administrators men who do not know a word of Greek or Hebrew and who possess neither judgment nor capacity . . . they have condemned books which they have never seen.

He protests warmly that scholars ought to be protected against their "arbitrary and ignorant omnipotence." Another scholar writes to Sirleto that the manuscript of his book had been passed by one censor, yet a second has kept it fifteen months for examination, and the printers have heavily fined him for not handing it to them at the contracted time. It was customary for publishers to pay an author an advance sum but stipulate that he would pay a fine if the manuscripts were not ready for press at the agreed time. An archbishop writes to Sirleto that his manuscript was passed more than a year ago, yet he is still waiting for license to print it. Other authors complain that the ignorant censors have altered the text, sometimes making them say what they have no mind to say. A new class of lawyers appeared at Rome to see to the interests of authors and publishers in connection with the new Congregation.

The city of Venice, where lived the famous scholar Sarpi, whose *History of the Council of Trent* is one of the few candid documents of the time, refused to have its authors and printers at the mercy of these Roman incompetents, and the Vatican had to make concessions. The rules of the Index, it explained with characteristic casuistry, applied at Venice as in other Italian cities, but it granted certain special "interpretations" of them. The local bishop could issue a permit to read condemned books and could pass expurgated editions of books that were held up for correction. The censors were to pass works in manuscript, not to demand that they be printed before they were examined; as was exacted in many places, with very grave loss to publishers. The names of the examiners were to be given on the book of the title-page of the book. Printers and booksellers were not required, as they were elsewhere, to take an oath of loyalty to the Church, every year. The Venetian Senate had always shown a healthy degree of independence in its relations with the Vatican, and it refused to pass the new Index until the Pope granted these concessions.

All other Italian cities except Naples were subject to the same paralyzing regulations as Rome, and literature and the book trade (except in pious rubbish) were ruined. Year by year the Congregation of the Index spread its net of spies over the land, and from its Roman office ignorant monks watched the paltry annual outcrop of literature. They were almost reduced to criticizing each other's books in Rome, which they did with great spirit. In 1607 the Master of the Sacred Palace issued the first, and only, Roman Index of Books to be Expurgated. They were, naturally, works by zealous Catholics, often Jesuits, which had revealed blemishes under the microscopic scrutiny of the censors, and there was such a spirited fight that the idea of Expurgatory Indices had to be abandoned. The Index continued to include a few works which it was forbidden to read until they were corrected or expurgated, but this gives no excuse for the common quotation of the work in non-Catholic and semi-Catholic writings as the Index Expurgatorius. The chief work of the Congregation was still to prohibit the printing or circulation of books, and it continued to be unintelligent. The works of Giordano Bruno, for instance, were not put on the Index until after he had been murdered by the Inquisition. It is true that he had written most of them out of Italy, but a Congregation which took cognizance of all sorts of obscure foreign heretics would not be moved by that consideration. The plain truth is that the Roman pedants, with their cramped medieval learning, were incapable of understanding the great works in which Bruno wove all the scientific speculations of the ancient Greeks into a Pantheistic philosophy of nature. On the other hand, they promptly put on one of their supplementary lists the Apology of James I of England.


I will resume the story of the Roman Index in a later chapter and may conclude this stage with a few general reflections on the effect of the censorship. The Dialogues of Galileo remind us that literature was not extinguished in Italy, but they remind us also how, when the more spirited cities of the north produced such a man as Galileo, Rome watched them with baleful vigilance. After the adventure of Galileo's book no literature that anybody cares to read today appeared in Italy until the work of Voltaire stirred some intellectual life in the country. Artistic feeling was almost extinct, and the general ignorance, even of the Bible, became such that Cardinal Baronius or one of his school inserted in the new Breviary, for the feast of St. Peter, the words: "God gave thee all the kingdoms of the world." The few who knew that in the gospel these words are part of Satan's mythical temptation of Jesus in the desert must have smiled. In short, Italy sank rapidly into the squalid ignorance and artistic and economic decay which the Popes preserved in their Papal States to the middle of the nineteenth century.

On the other hand, the plea that there was at least a moral and religious regeneration is almost entirely false. Naturally the old gaiety of the Papal Court could not be restored. Apart from the shrinking of the Papal income, it would have afforded in Protestant lands an argument against Rome which even a Jesuit could not have surmounted. The Popes of the seventeenth century were generally sober and mediocre men who would at least not have tolerated the extraordinary sexual candor of

Roman life from 1450 to 1550. Under cover, as I have elsewhere shown, human nature in the average remained the same. At the most one could say only that sexual life was to some extent made more furtive and morbid but in other respects (crime, violence, cheating, etc.) the Roman character easily betrayed that it was unchanged. It would, however, be a serious mistake to suppose that the Popes either suppressed or attempted to suppress even sexual irregularities to the extent to which Catholic writers and some others suppose. Let me recall one fact from my *History of the Church of Rome*. I described how a new and rather puritanical Duke of Tuscany about the middle of the eighteenth century set about the moral reform of his duchy, which included Florence. Bishop Ricci, his chief assistant, has left it on record that "for a century and a half before this the total corruption of the Dominican order had been a matter of scandal throughout Tuscany." This means that from the year 1600 onward, or during all the time when the Popes are supposed to have been guarding the new purity of the Church, the chief monastic body never deserted its old practices. They were, as I explained, flagrant and notorious. Monks slept night after night in open dormitories with the nuns. This, Ricci says, applies to all the nunneries of Tuscany, and the priests were as free as the monks and nuns. So far is it from true that Rome knew nothing of this—if any person cares to entertain so extravagant an idea—that the Papal Nuncio at Florence, who was on the most cordial terms with the corrupt monks and nuns, and the general of the Dominican Order at Rome, who was just as bad, vigorously supported the monks and nuns against the reformers, and the Vatican yielded only under heavy pressure. Such facts show that it is quite unhistorical to say that the censorship initiated by the Council of Trent purified the Church of its old disorders. Its only genuine concern was to prevent the Protestant rebellion from spreading.

CHAPTER V

THE CENSORSHIP IN OTHER LANDS

HE history of the Index is particularly interesting because it affords the largest part of the explanation why the countries of southern Europe generally remained subject to the Vatican while the northern nations generally rebelled against it. There is no room for fanciful speculations on this division of Europe. It has no more to do with racial characteristics than with climate, while the suggestion that the nations which lived farthest away from Rome were most liable to have its ways misrepresented to them by heretics is particularly unfortunate. It was a proverb in the Middle Ages that the nearer to Rome a man lived the more he disdained it. There is no need here to consider contributory causes, as the outstanding elements of the explanation are clear: bloody crusades which made an end of at least hundreds of thousands of heretics in France, Italy, and Bohemia, then the Inquisition, next the Index in conjunction with the Inquisition. The

first and second of these means of securing docility I have fully studied in earlier works. We have now to see the influence of the third in sealing Catholic countries against invasion of ideas from the lands of the heretics.

Spain is, from its geographical position, peculiarly fitted for intellectual isolation; or it was until the scientific developments of our time made such intellectual frontiers and tariffs impossible. But at the time of the Reformation Spain was much less isolated than in the eighteenth century. It was the central part of a broad empire which included the Netherlands, and the Spaniards were then one of the greatest navigating nations in the world. Thus the critical German works which so easily passed into Belgium were brought in large numbers to Spain on the merchant vessels that plied between the two countries. Spain was then only just entering upon the Renaissance, which was closing in Italy, and the stimulation of its fairly recent military triumph over the Moors and its conquests in America gave it a vitality like that of Elizabethan England. That is one reason why the Index stifled literature in Italy before it had the same effect in Spain. On the other hand, the fact that Spain's new greatness was founded upon a religious campaign against enemies of the faith, and that for a century afterwards political and religious interests were united in the stern measures taken against the Jews and Moriscoes, gave the Church an advantage which it had not in other countries.

Yet reform ideas at first made considerable progress in Spain. As I have earlier said, the works of Erasmus were translated into Spanish and were read by all literate people and greatly praised by distinguished prelates until the growth of heresy in Germany caused the Inquisition to examine them more closely. The works of Luther and his supporters were already forbidden at this time, but the repeated fulminations of Inquisitors and kings after 1530 show that numbers of heretical works were still smuggled into the country to meet the native demand. We learn from the ordinance of the Spanish Inquisitor General in 1530 that Lutheran works circulated in large numbers under false titles, and that there were special editions of Catholic works in which Lutheran notes were inserted. The machinery of the censorship was introduced, and there was the same drastic control as in Italy. Printers had to have special licenses, and agents of the Inquisition descended upon libraries and bookstores in search of the forbidden material. It was necessary later to sharpen the penalties, so there seems still to have been a lively demand for critical literature. In view of the severe character of the Spanish Inquisition this is surprising, and it gives us some means of estimating how Protestantism would have spread in Spain if there had not been this rigorous censorship with the grim forces of the Inquisitors behind it.

For the use of these agents lists of heretical works had to be prepared. The Louvain Index was enlarged by the addition of Spanish and English works, and it was published in 1551 and in several later years. A peculiar feature of the Spanish lists is the condemnation of a number of Catholic prayer books and pictures. These had been introduced into the Netherlands, and sympathizers with the Reformation used them to

bring contempt on the Church. "Garden of the Soul" is still a popular name for Catholic prayer books, and it appears that in the later Middle Ages the presses turned out one with this title, which was in many respects scandalous. Reusch says that many of the illustrations in it were "obscene." St. Ursula and her virgin companions, for instance, were shown quite nude, the pagan soldiers taking a very indelicate interest in their persons. Some of the promises made in recommending the efficacy of prayers given in the book also were a great offense to Protestants. The most obviously false examples were quoted. For instance, in proof of the efficacy of a prayer that one might not die without the opportunity of confessing, it was said that a Spaniard who had recited it daily came to have his head cut off, but his soul remained in his head until he had confessed his sins and received absolution.

As the usual heavy fines (ordinarily \$500) were imposed, and an informer got his share, and as the priests were instructed to press every penitent about the possession of heretical books, we may suppose that by 1560 the spread of heresy was checked. Royal authority was the more easily enlisted as the sale of indulgences, which gave such offense in Germany, was profitable, both to State and Church in Spain, and the Jesuits and Inquisitors took care that the Spanish people should have no suspicion of the enormity of the sale suggested to their minds. The Inquisitors, therefore, had merely to see that the ships from the north imported no heretical books and to watch the works of Spanish theologians. How this worked out in practice is well illustrated by the famous, or infamous, case of Archbishop Carranza.

Bartolomè Carranza was a learned and pious Dominican monk, a deputy at the Council of Trent, and a zealot against heresy, who had become Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of the Spanish Church. His advancement had aroused a good deal of jealousy, notably in the breast of his fellow-monk Melchor Cano, who was reputed the most learned theologian of his order, and the Inquisitor General Valdes, Archbishop of Seville. In 1558 Carranza published a book, and his enemies discovered heresy in it. A university which ventured to declare the book orthodox was heavily punished, and a number of theologians were induced to verify the hurried discovery of heresy. Carranza, to the great scandal of Spain, was imprisoned in the dungeons of the Inquisition at Valladolid, vilely treated, and charged with heresy. He represented to the king that the Inquisitor General, his brother archbishop, was acting from spite and demanded an impartial judge. At the trial, however, his enemies so vehemently and unscrupulously pressed passages of his book, his unpublished papers, and even his conversation, that he appealed to Rome. The Pope demanded that he be shipped to Italy, but the Spanish king stood upon his privileges and refused. For six years, during which the archbishop remained in prison, theologians both in Spain and Italy wrangled over the book and with each other, the majority seeing no harm in passages which others pronounced damnably heretical. A special committee of the Council of Trent found the book quite sound and worthy to be read everywhere, but the Spaniards prevented the Council from endorsing this verdict.

All this went on for twenty years, as we shall see, at the time when,

according to Dr. Putnam, the Reformation had led to a high degree of scholarship as well as character in the Church. After six years of squabbles King Philip, seeing the hopeless division of his Spanish theologians, asked the Pope to send a special legate to sit with the Inquisition, and another year was spent in the quarrel. Then a Dominican monk and admirer of Carranza became Pope Pius V, and he compelled the Spaniards to depose their Inquisitor General and Archbishop—he was permitted to retire on the ground of advanced age—and send Carranza to Rome with the records of the trial. Under guard of a troop of inquisitors the unhappy archbishop reached Rome and was confined in a private house. It was found that the Spaniards had kept back some documents, and the delay in getting these and translating the records, which ran to twenty-four volumes of a thousand pages each, occupied several further years. The new trial was a spirited fight of Carranza's Spanish friends and enemies, and at the end of it, fourteen years after the first impeachment, the Pope came to the profound conclusion that Carranza should be set free but should revise the equivocal passages of his work. Unfortunately, the favorable Pope died at that juncture, and his much less pious successor, Gregory XIII, found Carranza "vehemently suspected of heresy" and imposed a severe sentence on him. Ana, the zealous monk-archbishop, who had quite certain never had the least intention of differing from the Church, died a fortnight later, after eighteen years of bitter persecution. Dr. Putnam has strangely omitted to translate this story from the pages of Reusch.

In Belgium, where both language and land approached so nearly to Germany, the Spanish Inquisitors had to sustain a sterner fight against heresy. In Holland they succeeded only in inspiring a rebellion which finally delivered that country from the yoke of Spain and the Pope. The Belgian provinces, on the other hand, were retained and purified of heresy by a violence that reddens the pages of history. Even the enforcement of the censorship was more violent than elsewhere and testifies to the native tendency and determination to follow Germany. Dr. Putnam prefers to put it that "the faith of the believing subjects of the Emperor Charles was threatened most seriously by heretical writings from Holland and Germany," and it was "quite fitting" that Louvain University should publish the first Index. He does not explain that the penalties for having, buying, or printing heretical books were so barbarous that it was essential to have an official list. The printer of an heretical book was to be branded, on a public scaffold, with a cross-shaped hot iron, to have an eye gouged out by the public executioner, or to have a hand cut off. If he published a book without authorization, and even if it did not contain a single offensive word, he incurred a fine of \$750 and perpetual banishment (and ruin). The bookseller who sold unauthorized books was liable to a sentence of death. The man who surreptitiously imported books lost one-third of his property and was banished forever (which generally meant the loss of the other two-thirds). The bookseller who failed to have a copy of the Index exhibited in his shop was fined \$250, and every shop was visited at least twice a year by agents of the bishop. Cases of books from abroad must not be opened except in the presence of servants of the bishop or the Inquisition. And

obstinate retainers of heretical books were to be beheaded or burned if they were men, buried alive if they were women.

Such was the gentle art of protecting the threatened faith of the subjects of Charles V and Philip II; and in return those timorous subjects waged one of the longest and most savage wars of the period against their pious "protectors" for the right to mind their own business. It is significant that Philip II, thirty years after the beginning of repressive measures, had to make them sterner than ever. As late as 1566 and 1567 four printers and booksellers of Antwerp were condemned for offenses against the censorship to long terms of imprisonment (four to six years), one was sent to the infamous galleys for six years, and one was hanged. By this time a most rigorous system of examination had been in force for years. Several times a year a raid was made without warning on all bookshops and printing works. The doors were sealed, and then, at their leisure, a representative of the bishop and a Franciscan monk went over the stock. Every year also the printer or bookseller had to renew his oath of religious loyalty. There was not, as some suggest, a corresponding rise of orthodox scholarship. The Antwerp authorities in 1569 issued a supplement to the Trent Index. It was, says Reusch, "one of the worst of all." The compilers, for instance, heard rumors of a terrible heretic in England named Yuellus, or in a later version Jonellus, which the learned Index-makers of Rome turned into John Juellus. They meant Bishop Jewell; and no one in either country was ever likely to read him in any case.

Of Portugal I need not speak separately, as the procedure was much the same as in Spain. We now, therefore, have the full explanation of the retention of Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Belgium by the Popes. That beautiful "loyalty" to the Vatican of which such pretty things are sometimes said was about as real as the loyalty of Cubans to Spain or to the United States. All men of such spirit and vitality that they wanted to examine for themselves this new quarrel which rent the world were ruined, killed, driven abroad, or bludgeoned into a sullen silence and docility, and the Papal agents then inoculated the remainder with their fictitious account of Protestantism and of Papal history, genially conscious that their readers had no chance of discovering the untruth. We will quite admit that many of these clerical agents of the censorship sincerely believed that they protected the souls of men from eternal damnation, but a study of the life of the Church in every age shows that these were a small minority. The scandalous case of Carranza reveals how little delicacy and sincerity there was even in monks and prelates who were considered genuinely religious. But this thin pretext that Catholic princes or prelates were, as a body, piously concerned to keep what they regarded as a danger of damnation from the souls of their subjects is, as I have earlier explained, decisively refuted by the general indifference to the circulation of erotic literature. Ten books against faith were condemned for one against morals, and in the latter case it was almost always a reflection on the morals of the clergy that was resented. The enormous popularity of Rabelais and the generosity of the Pope to him in the very heart of this period of rigorous censorship make a mockery of all these attempts to idealize the action of the

medieval Church. Overwhelmingly that action was taken to preserve the power and wealth of the Popes, clergy, and monks; and to the price of it in human blood and suffering and starvation of intellectual life they were callously indifferent.

In the remaining provinces of the Catholic world, France and South Germany, the censorship had to proceed differently. Some day a very interesting work will be written telling veraciously the rapid progress of the revolt against Rome in countries which are generally represented as clinging nervously to the old faith and calling for protection against the infection of heresy. It will probably convince the reader that but for Rome's ghastly system of intellectual tyranny the Papal Church would have disappeared long ago, and the world would be two centuries farther advanced in civilization than it is. I have in earlier works given some suggestive evidence in that connection, and the truth will be further revealed in a few observations on the censorship in France and South Germany.

The reader who has any knowledge at all of the religious history of France may be surprised to learn that there was in that country much the same control of the production and circulation of books as in Italy. The facts that stand out in the calendar are that, in spite of the execution of thousands of Protestants, they were so numerous in France by 1572 that in Paris alone more than 20,000—Ranke accepts the estimate of 50,000—generally of the middle or noble class, were murdered in the St. Bartholomew Massacre; that they remained sufficiently numerous to take the field and defend their cities against the royal armies, and that in 1685, after a century and a half of persecution, half a million of them left the country; that France nevertheless had the most independent and defiant of all national branches of the Catholic Church, was the first country to disestablish its Church, and in modern times has been far in advance of any other country in the rejection of all creeds and Churches. Yet all this progress in revolt was made in spite of a rigorous system of censorship.

The control of literature, or the practice of suppressing truth, began in the new scale as early as 1521, when the king, impelled by the University of Paris, a narrowly orthodox body of theologians, forbade the printing of any works on religion which had not been examined and authorized by the theological faculty of the university. Nine years later—to omit much of the detail you find in works on the censorship—literary Inquisitors, civil and clerical, of the usual type were appointed, and every printing shop and bookstore began to be watched. Ten years later again (1542) the regulations had to be strengthened, for Protestant ideas were spreading alarmingly. Calvin had been driven out of the country, and the spirit of persecution was rampant, yet heretical literature circulated and was in great demand. It was now required that no copy of the Bible or of any work on religion should be published unless it was passed by four theological censors, and every bale of books arriving at Paris from the provinces or abroad should be opened in the presence of four booksellers who had taken an oath of loyalty, and every book should be examined by clerical agents. For the guidance of these agents lists of heretical works were drawn up. Rabelais was at

first included in these lists, probably because of his caustic criticisms of monastic life, but Cardinal de Chatillon, an Inquisitor General, induced the king to have his name removed from the Index.

By the middle of the sixteenth century the rules for the enforcement of the Index were as drastic as in Italy, and these rules continued to be enforced throughout the century. No books could be imported from Protestant cities, and every package of imported books had to be opened in the presence of officials of the censorship. Printers had to be registered and must do work only at registered addresses, which were periodically and unexpectedly visited. Every bookstore had to be visited at least twice a year; in Lyons at least three times a year by agents of the archbishop. Every bookseller had to exhibit a copy of the list of prohibited books and an up-to-date list of all the books in stock. Hawking of books was strictly forbidden. Translations of the Bible and anonymous works were sought with particular vigilance, and many of them were burned. Three cardinals were appointed Inquisitors General for the control of literature, and the royal authority and that of the Paris Parliament were at the back of every measure. Yet the demand for heretical books went on. Wine casks from Germany were seized at the ports and found to be full of books. It certainly looks at first sight as if the nation were piously guarding itself against the taint of heresy; but the historical fact is that in spite of half a century of these drastic and oppressive hindrances to freedom of discussion the Protestants had by 1570 grown to the numbers of something like half a million and included in their body some of the highest of the nobility. What would have happened in France if there had been complete liberty to read and think, no massacres, religious wars, and burnings of heretics, and no control of education by lying Jesuits?

In Germany the first success of the Church against Luther was followed at once by a rigorous attempt to control literature. The Emperor Charles V in 1521 ordered under severe penalties that henceforward no one must print, copy, buy, sell or own the works of Luther or any works or pictures that criticize the faith or reflect on the clergy; and that no one shall print copies of the Bible or works on religion until they have been examined and authorized by the bishop or the theological faculty. It is rather mean to throw the responsibility of these things today on kings and emperors. There were very few monarchs in Europe in two centuries who had a personal zeal of that kind. Their acts were dictated by the bishops and the Papal Nuncios. However, the regulations were carried out very imperfectly in Germany, and it is useless to enumerate the successive decrees. By 1555 they were restricted to Catholic provinces and cities, other provinces now being definitely recognized as Protestant.

The chief Catholic German state was Bavaria, and it will be enough to describe how its people were "protected" from the infection of truth. Jesuits were put in charge of the machinery of repression, and there was very little that escaped the eyes of the Jesuits and their spies. In 1566 they drew up, not merely an Index of Prohibited Books, but a list of books which the Bavarians were kindly permitted to sell, buy, and read. Even the monasteries were supplied with lists of books that they must

burn and books that it is advisable to read. Putnam observes that the monks were urged to follow the lead of the Council of Trent, yet in the list of books recommended there are several which are on the Trent Index. During 1569 and 1570 the censors were busy searching the whole country for what the Jesuits regarded as pernicious literature. Every library, private as well as public, and every bookstore was carefully examined. When a man died his property was searched for heretical books, and the most drastic penalties were appointed for any who were found in possession of the condemned literature.

One would think that by this time the people of Bavaria were sufficiently protected against the books which the wicked heretics were forcing upon them, yet for the next ten or dozen years we still find the Jesuit dictators using the ducal voice to denounce the circulation of bad books (against faith—they rarely mention morals in Bavaria). In 1581 they clamor for special supervisors of the popular fairs, in which hawkers of books were found amongst the vendors of all sorts of commodities, and they demand a new inspection of private and public libraries. That was the general condition of the Catholic provinces of south Germany. Bohemia alone distinguished itself by drawing up a list of obscene as well as lists of heretical books; and in Bohemia heresy made such headway that the promising civilization had to be almost trodden out under the hoofs of Catholic armies. But what happened in the seventeenth century, and how Austria came to take the lead and preserve its faith, we shall see later.

The reader who tries to visualize this vast army of spies and agents of the Church watching every bookstore, library, and printing shop, every parcel of books imported and every book in circulation, in every town and city from Lisbon to Prague and Cracow, during two hundred years, will not require any further explanation why southern Europe remained Roman Catholic; nor will he read without disgust the familiar language about the devoted Mother Church protecting its children from heresies which they abhorred. If we bear in mind that hardly ten per cent of the people in these countries could read, we realize the full truth about the Index. It was a clerical stratagem for protecting the interests of the clergy, and it did a profound injury to the race, as the history of Spain, Portugal, and Italy shows, by preventing the free interchange and criticism of ideas.

The apologists do not fail to retort that the Protestant Churches were as bad as the Catholic; some, as we saw, declare that the Protestants were more tyrannical, dishonorable, and mischievous in their censorship. If this were the case, we should be very much puzzled by the contrast of the vitality of Holland with the decay of Belgium, or the splendor of English literature after 1600 with the lamentable plight of Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian literature. But it is quite untrue. We should, in any case, remember that the Protestants did not create the tradition of intellectual tyranny and sectarian savagery which had got into the blood of Europe. They inherited a gross code of public morals, and they learned to reject it long before Italy and Spain did. For instance, although in England the secret Catholic propaganda was quite habitually allied with political conspiracy, the death sentence on religious grounds was abol-

ished—it had, of course, been inherited from the Catholics—long before it was abolished in Spain or Italy, where there was not the same political complication to give an excuse for it.

In his second volume Dr. Putnam gives, chiefly from the Jesuit Hilgers, whose miserable sophistry he reproduces with singular leniency, all the available evidence for censorship in Protestant countries. We saw that in his Introduction Dr. Putnam informs his readers that more books were condemned, and “with less honorable purpose,” in Protestant than in Catholic countries. In this he follows the Jesuits’ example of putting on the Catholic side only the books condemned by clerical authorities (or at their bidding) on religious grounds, while on the Protestant side he counts the suppressions of books and persecutions of authors on political and other secular grounds. That kind of thing might be left to Jesuits. In point of fact, when we compare strictly religious censorships, we find, as we should expect, that in the sixteenth century the Protestant leaders at first closely imitate the Catholics, but they very soon relax, while there is not the least relaxation of the tyranny of the Roman Church.

Switzerland is taken first, and for the obvious reason that Calvin was a blood-brother of Torquemada, and the Calvinists might be expected to come closest to the savagery of the Romanists. But after the death of Calvin, in 1564, Dr. Putnam gives us only one act of tyranny, the execution of a heretic, and that was only two years after Calvin’s disappearance. The only other incident given for Calvinistic Switzerland after 1564 is that once in the seventeenth century a book was suppressed at Geneva, and the author was *compensated* by the civic authorities! For the Protestant states of Germany the evidence is just as feeble. Naturally, Luther and the early Protestant leaders generally tried to suppress Papist, and even Calvinist books, in the spirit of their age; though Zwingli and a few others pleaded for toleration. But we hear nothing about hands being cut off, or eyes gouged out, or women buried alive, or clerical dungeons of some Protestant Inquisition. Commonly a license to print was needed, but the penalties were generally light. In the duchy of Weimar an unauthorized book was confiscated, and a printer or bookseller was fined only if he offended repeatedly; and the theologians of Jena University warmly protested even against this degree of tyranny. The heaviest punishment mentioned by Putnam and Hilgers is, in Saxony, a fine of three thousand gulden for printing a Protestant work, a book of Melancthon! Beyond these cases the authors give for the German States only mild rebukes and exhortations, small fines, and in one case deposition from office. When we come to the second half of the eighteenth century, with the growth of revolutionary ideas, we, of course, find a tightening of the political censorship, but I decline to bring this into the comparison. The real comparison is between Catholic Belgium and the Protestant states of Germany after 1550; and it is in our present connection and comparison of savagery and civilization. To bring modern anti-Socialist laws into the comparison is monstrous.

In the case of Holland and Denmark we are offered for the sixteenth century various decrees prohibiting the reading of Catholic books, but there is no mention of punishment. For the seventeenth century we have


one case of imprisonment for accepting the opinions of Spinoza and several condemnations of the works of Spinoza and Hobbes. There is again not the least comparison between the savage censorship in Catholic Belgium and the censorship in Protestant Holland, Denmark and Scandinavia. In the case of England, after it became Protestant, we are told, from the Jesuit Hilgers, that "throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth there was a persistent and bloody persecution against freedom of thought of any kind." This is quite false, and the Jesuit gives little positive evidence in support of it. There was, notoriously, under Elizabeth little persecution even of Catholics, of whom there were still large numbers in England, until they were involved in political conspiracies. After the year 1612 no one was executed for heresy in England, yet it is after that date, in the course of the seventeenth century, that Hilgers finds the closest approach of a Protestant country to the bloody tyranny of the Church in Catholic lands. Even in Putnam's summary the record sounds horrid. The law imposes heavy fines, long periods of imprisonment, public flogging, even physical mutilation for reading and circulating forbidden books.

I have no more idea of defending these barbarities of Protestant or Puritan authorities than of defending Inquisitors, but, besides recalling once more that the Protestants inherited these practices from Catholics, and soon abandoned them, one may observe that even if in one single area of the Protestant world—and that most exceptionally rent by politico-religious quarrels—during a comparatively short time we do find some analogy to the Index and Inquisition, it does not in the least justify the statement that Protestants, generally, were as bad as, or worse than, Catholics. In most Protestant countries the exercise of the censorship was lenient, and it was exactly in Protestant Holland, where the worst cases are quoted, that the French skeptics got works published which even comparatively liberal France would not allow to be printed. But when one reads J. M. Robertson's minute account, in his *History of Free-thought*, of "British Free-thought in the Seventeenth Century" (Vol. II, ch. XIV), one sees what a price any author pays for repeating the statements of a Jesuit without strict verification. Robertson shows that, however drastic the regulations of the Star Chamber seem in print, a vast amount of heretical literature, of all shades, appeared in London in the course of the seventeenth century. He quotes one clerical writer after another refuting atheists and deists and lamenting that the country is full of what he calls blasphemous literature. It was in that century in England that Hobbes inaugurated the next advance of thought, and Milton (in 1644) made the noblest plea for freedom of literature ("Areopagitica") that had ever appeared. A Presbyterian writer of the time, Thomas Edwards, writes that "every day now brings forth books for Toleration," and he enumerates a hundred and eighty sects, including deists and atheists. It was just this seventeenth century in England, which seems so barbaric in the pages of Hilgers and those who follow him, that gave birth to the Royal Society of Science and the first great scientific movement, set the world an example of the rights of the people over kings, inaugurated modern philosophy (Locke), and established Deism as the next phase of human thought. One is amazed that any

writer should repeat the ridiculous attempt of a Jesuit to put this stirring and advancing England on a level, in the matter of repression of thought, with the dumb and decaying lands in which Rome's censorship was enforced.

CHAPTER VI

THE BIBLE AS A PROHIBITED BOOK

HERE is probably more space devoted to the Bible in the Indexes of the sixteenth century than to any other book. A collection of the condemnations of it would fill this chapter. It is forbidden in Hebrew and Greek, in Latin and the modern languages. It is forbidden as a whole, and forbidden in separate parts or books. It is therefore quite intelligible that Protestants should urge against Catholics the reproach that their Church long forbade people to read the Bible, and the Catholic apologist has devoted much of his versatile and not very scrupulous ingenuity to the subject. In his own Catholic world he is apt to say that the Church of the sixteenth century forbade the reading of the Bible because the heretics had published adulterated editions of it. But the Catholic is at least free, though not at all encouraged, to read the Roman Index—if he knows Latin or Italian—and he can easily ascertain that unimpeachable Catholic editions were forbidden as well as editions printed in Geneva or Germany. He has then frankly to admit that the reading of the Bible was a prolific source of heresy, and that in its maternal concern for the minds of its children the Church wisely directed that they receive the words of the Bible only from those who were trained to interpret it. These sectarian attacks and defenses generally leave the historical facts obscure, and the reader may care to have them accurately set out in a special chapter.

It is, in the first place, not entirely true that the Bible was confined to clerical use until the fifteenth century. There were occasional periods when the nobles learned Latin, and from the twelfth century onward, when sons of the middle and higher class were educated as well as priests, Latin was a general accomplishment of the literate minority. That few of them read the Bible is suggested by the fact that heresies or revolts based on it generally started from clerics, who then translated the New Testament for illiterate followers. There is evidence of translations into popular tongues in the days of Charlemagne, but as literacy was then confined to clerics they need not be taken into account. They were certainly not read to the people as part of the Church service, which was in Latin. In the eleventh century, again, when Europe was reawakening, we find traces of translations of the Bible, and the Church begins to regard them with suspicion. Pope Gregory VII writes to the Duke of Bohemia in the year 1080 to say that it is quite agreeable to God that the people should not have the Bible. Familiarity is apt to breed contempt, he says, and the text might "lead men of perverse intellect into error." In other words, Hildebrand is acutely conscious that if the laity read the Bible they will find in it no sanction of the colossal system of priestcraft

he has constructed. Characteristically—for he resolutely held that the end justifies the means (even forgery and war)—he reconciles the Duke to his position thus:

The primitive Church concealed many things which later, when Christianity was fully established, were after subtle examination put right by the Holy Fathers.

But it was not until a century later that acute trouble arose.

In the year 1199 the Bishop of Metz wrote to tell Pope Innocent III that men and women meet in his diocese to read the Scriptures, and this leads to contempt of the clergy. It is clear that we have here an extension of the great evangelical or early Protestant movement which, at the same time as the Albigensian (anti-Christian) heresy, was spreading over Europe. Innocent replied that the reading of the Scriptures was commendable but these private conventicles must be suppressed, as in them the laity usurp the functions of the clergy. We saw how Innocent reacted. In his comparatively short pontificate he must have slain over one-half a million "heretics," and he laid the foundations of the Inquisition. On the specific question of the Bible he says that "the sacred mysteries of the faith are not to be expounded indiscriminately to all" and "such is the profundity of the Holy Scripture that not only the simple and illiterate, but even the prudent and learned, are not wholly competent to discover its meaning." This, we are told, is not a prohibition of vernacular translations or of the reading of the Bible by laymen. A Catholic may be content with this assurance, but the Pope quite plainly means that the laity must approach the Bible only through the priest.

This disturbing evangelical movement continued, nevertheless, in every province of Christendom, and we find synod after synod in the first half of the thirteenth century forbidding the laity to read the Bible. In 1229 the Synod of Toulouse expressly said: "We forbid the laity to have the books of the Old and the New Testament." They could have the Psalms in Latin, but "we most strictly forbid them to have these in the vernacular tongue." Several French synods made the same prohibition. Some forbade the laity to have any works on theology. Dr. Putnam says that there was no prohibition in Spain until Lutheranism appeared, but the Synod of Tarragona in 1234 sternly forbade the laity to read the Bible. "Any who have copies," it said, "must within eight days of the publication of this hand them to the bishop to be burned." Any who retained a copy of the Bible incurred suspicion of heresy. King James I of Aragon laid down that law for his kingdom, and the Pope confirmed it. Several Spanish synods and monarchs, including Ferdinand and Isabella, repeated the law under severe penalties. In England the enormous spread of Wyclifism led to a similar reaction, but the law forbade only unauthorized translations until Lutheranism spread. Then, in 1530 and later, Henry VIII forbade the "common people" to read the Bible. Copies of Tyndale's translation were burned at times, but the King soon broke with Rome, and the people were encouraged to read the Bible. German translations of the Bible circulated freely amongst the laity from the latter part of the fourteenth to the latter part of the fifteenth century. When the printing press multiplied copies, though very

slowly and at great expense, the bishops became more interested. The Archbishop of Mainz in 1486, asking scornfully how "women and the lower classes" could expect to understand so profound a book, pronounced excommunication on all who, without express authorization, printed, sold, or bought translations of parts of the Bible. It was, said other clerics, like putting knives in the hands of children. The clergy were divided, for the taunt of their critics, that they were afraid to let people read the life and words of Christ, made them less ready to condemn reading of the Bible wherever there was a Protestant population. In the German provinces after the Reformation we generally find Catholic translations in the vernacular permitted and only the Lutheran or Calvinist editions strictly forbidden.

Thus to the time of the Council of Trent the attitude of the Church toward the reading of the Bible by laymen was dictated entirely by its own interests. To the eleventh century very few except the priests could read, and few of those who took any serious interest in the Bible or knew Latin well enough to read the very poor and elementary Latin in which the Vulgate is written. The economic advance of Europe in the eleventh century created a class of literate laymen, and the comparative purification of the Papacy led to the appearance of a larger number of genuinely religious priests. These at once perceived the glaring contrast between the ecclesiastical system which they knew and the teaching of Christ and the apostles. The audacious theory which I have quoted in the words of Gregory VII—that Christ really communicated privately to the apostles of the elaborate design of a sacerdotal and ritual Church—which Catholics still meekly accept—was disdained by many, and there began the attack on the wealth, ritual, and teaching of the Church which was to cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of men and women in the next three centuries. Since the Bible was obviously the chief source of this revolt, the Church of Rome urgently wished to keep it from the laity, but it was generally restrained, and driven to sophistical pretenses, by the sheer absurdity of its statement that the Bible contained the very words of Jesus, yet one needed a long clerical education to understand them. We must judge these things by the historical facts, not from contact with smooth-spoken modern priests or smooth-writing Jesuits and Paulists. The first fact is that it was not the nebulosities of Paul's theology, but the very plainest words of Jesus in the gospels, which inspired revolt against Rome. The second fact is that the majority of Popes and prelates, priests and monks, in those centuries were *not* men who would have a tender and pious concern about the souls of the laity.

In dealing with the second period I would put aside all condemnations of editions of the Bible which had been published by heretics. The prohibition of these is part of the general policy of prohibiting heretical works. One wonders how there could be such vital differences between Catholic and Protestant editions of the Bible, and in point of fact, as far as the text is concerned, there were not many material differences in the gospels. That the text really was manipulated by priest editors is shown by Putnam—who, however, mildly remarks that it merely shows that "their zeal had outrun their standard of accurate scholarship"—in connection with a French Catholic translation. When Louis XIV re-

voked the Edict of Nantes in 1685, in the Church's final effort to crush Protestantism, the Jesuits were directed to prepare a version of the Bible, and the king distributed a hundred thousand copies of it amongst "converted" Huguenots. Their Protestant Bibles were, of course, destroyed. English Protestants got copies of this French New Testament, and they pointed out that it contained variations which no candid reader can regard as other than gross falsifications. In Acts XIII, 2, it is said that sons of the early Christian leaders "ministered to the Lord." The French text made this, "They offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the Mass"; a surprising audacity, as even a Jesuit would hardly claim that the Mass existed in St. Paul's time. In I Corinthians, III, 15 (not II, 15) it is said: "But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The French version has "as by the fire of Purgatory." In I Timothy, IV, I, the words "some shall depart from the faith" are changed to "from the Roman faith." These bits of roguery show how much could be done by inserting a word here and there, but generally the particular poison of one side or the other was put in footnotes. Erasmus had put very damaging notes to his edition of the Greek New Testament, and in the heat of the Lutheran controversy both sides issued annotated Bibles. Each, naturally, put its enemy's version on the Index.

We must further not forget that in most provinces where the Catholic Church forbade the reading of a particular edition of the Bible, the people had, unlike the Protestants, no other edition to choose instead. It was often equivalent to forbidding the reading of the Bible. But it is better to confine ourselves here to the simple issue whether, and when, the Roman Church forbade its members to read any translation of the Bible and thus kept it from the hands of the laity generally. The Council of Trent approached the question in an early sitting, but the differences of opinion which enlivened that Spirit-guided assembly—the French prelate members of it made naughtier jokes about the Holy Spirit in connection with it than any heretic now does—were as acute here as in regard to the sale of indulgences. The Spanish and Italian prelates wanted to issue a simple prohibition to publish or read translations of the Bible. The Germans said that such a prohibition would dangerously strengthen the Protestant propaganda in Germany. Council adjourned (to allow the troops to settle the heretics in a simpler fashion) without a decision, and it was nearly twenty years later when the debate was resumed at Trent. The third of the ten rules prefixed to the Trent Index deals with the subject, and a translation of it is given in Putnam. Setting aside the question of equivocal versions, the plain ruling is that translations may be read by "learned and pious men at the discretion of the bishop." The fourth rule says that either bishops or inquisitors may give permission, in writing, to read translations of the Bible to "those persons whose faith and piety will, they apprehend, be augmented, and not injured, by it." The severest spiritual penalties are imposed for transgression, and the motive is clearly stated to be that experience has shown that the indiscriminate circulation of translations has done "more evil than good."

In this first Papal declaration, therefore, we have almost, but not quite, a total prohibition of reading translations of the Bible, since the Pope evidently has in view a very small class of educated Catholics of

exceptional piety. It is very little short of the truth to say that the Council and Pope forbade the laity to read the Bible. The ferocious Sixtus IV soon altered the rule and decreed that no one could read a translation of the Bible without a permit from the Vatican itself, which none but a recognized theologian would dare to solicit; and a theologian could read the Bible in Latin. This in effect meant a total prohibition of the reading of the Bible by the laity, but we saw that later Popes softened the harsh commands of Pope Sixtus. Six years later Pope Clement VIII restored the rule that the bishop or local head of the Inquisition could give permission, and this virtual prohibition, as it clearly is, was in force until 1757, when Benedict XIV allowed the free circulation of Catholic and annotated translations of the Bible; but in a very ambiguous ruling of the year 1836 Pope Gregory XVI laid it down that the Church must follow both Benedict XIV and the fourth rule of Trent, so that in the first half of the nineteenth century Catholics were very much divided. Many still held to the Trent rule, that it could not be read without the permission of the Bishop. The reader with historical information will, of course, at once understand this tortuousness. In the progressive years from Voltaire to Napoleon the Church was forced to relax its tyranny, but it returned to the old rule in the reaction after Waterloo.

These facts will make clear the official attitude of the Church in regard to vernacular translations of the Bible. From 1564 to 1757 the Popes virtually, though not literally, forbade the reading of such translations and therefore forbade the laity to read the Bible. The few "men of learning and piety" to whom a bishop might give a permit were just the men who could be relied upon to respect the wish of the Church that such translations ought not to exist. From 1757 to 1836 annotated translations, which read marvelous meanings into dangerous texts, were free to the ten per cent of the people who could read. After 1836 an attempt was made to shut the laity off once more from the Bible, but the gradual conquest of the reaction forced the Popes to abandon the attempt.

One has to remember, however, that the ruling of the Council of Trent and of the Roman Index was rejected by the greater part of the Catholic world. We shall later find distinguished French Catholics ironically remarking that these ignoramuses at Rome have done them an honor by putting documents of theirs on the Roman Index, and Spain was ready at all times to tell the Papacy to mind its own business. The idea that the half of Europe which remained Catholic formed a beautiful unity under the guidance of Rome is preposterous. The policy in regard to reading the Bible differed everywhere, but there was in it one simple principle which puts out of court the excuses of Catholic writers. Wherever, as in Italy, a Catholic population was quite out of contact with Protestants who might point out that the Roman Church was condemned by the New Testament itself, it was strictly forbidden to read that dangerous work; and the degree of liberty to read was proportioned to the contact with Protestants or liberal writers.

In Portugal, for instance, the tyranny was worst of all. Not only were vernacular translations of the Bible forbidden, but an author was put on the Index, at least for expurgation, if he made a lengthy or

indiscreet quotation from the Bible. Thus one of the greatest poets, Lope de Vega, introduced into his *Shepherds of Bethlehem* the chants from the gospels which are known to Catholics as the Magnificat, Benedictus, and Nunc Dimittis. They were struck out by the censors. In Spain the reading of vernacular translations of the Bible was forbidden. We read that "at the order of King Charles V" the Inquisitor General issued this prohibition in 1551. We might just as well say that the Inquisitor General gave the order to the king, so that it would have the royal authority behind it. In several later years of the sixteenth century the prohibition was renewed, and it remained the law of the Church in Spain until 1778. My readers will not ask why at this date the tyranny was slightly relaxed, and "men of learning and piety" might now read a translation, if they could find one, by special permission of the bishop. But it was quite safe to relax the rule. Ley quotes a councillor of the Spanish Inquisition saying in 1791 that most Spaniards did not know of the existence of the Bible and the few who knew regarded it with horror as the source of Protestantism. The spirit of French humanism was, through Count D'Aranda and other cultivated statesmen, invading the country. Naples, being under Spanish rule, had the same law. Several synods there forbade the bishops to give permission to the laity to read translations—in other words, to read the Bible.

It is thus roundly true to say that in the greater part of the Catholic world the laity were prevented from reading the Bible from the middle of the sixteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century or later. The matter is psychologically important, not merely an issue of sectarian controversy, as it goes far to explain the general docility of those countries to Rome until the latter part of the eighteenth century. People thought and knew a great deal more about the saints and the mother of Jesus than they did about Jesus. They could, as we shall see, accept the grossest forgeries about the early Church because few of them had more than a very vague idea of the teaching, apart from moral counsels, and life of Jesus and the apostles as described in the New Testament.

But this policy could not be sustained in the northern lands, where the minds of Catholics were apt at any time to be disturbed by Protestants. "In France, Germany and Holland," says a French Catholic of the eighteenth century, "the Bible is read by all without distinction." We must correct that to the extent of saying that Catholics in the northern lands might read the Bible, in carefully annotated and sometimes falsified translations. Very few Catholics read the Bible today, though passages of the New Testament are read to them from the pulpit on Sundays. However, even the Jesuits had to report to Rome that it was advisable not to enforce its rule in Germany and the Netherlands. It was too obvious an argument of the Protestants that the Church forbade its members to read the Bible because they would find that Jesus was a deadly enemy of ecclesiasticism of that type.

As we should expect in view of the conditions, there was no consistent policy in France. The Sorbonne, the theological faculty of the University, was from the start opposed to the translation of the Bible, but an anonymous French translation, which was adopted and improved by the theological faculty at Louvain, obtained a royal license in France and

could be read by the laity. I have on an earlier page given a few illustrations of the way in which it had been made orthodox. However, apart from the Huguenots very few read the Bible until the Jansenist or Puritan controversy in the second half of the seventeenth century. The Puritans naturally encouraged the reading of the Bible, and this led to a fresh reaction of the bishops and theologians against such reading. In such a country as France, however, with its close contact with England, Holland, and Germany, and growing body of liberals at home, it was not possible to apply such rules as were applied in Italy and Spain. One bishop permitted the people to read the Bible while another refused. The Jesuits were the chief opponents of liberty. They held that "the greater part of the Church" was prevented by its rules from reading the Bible; and this majority they described as including "all women rustics, soldiers, and private individuals," or nine-tenths of the nation. The Puritan movement was so large, however, that many editions of the French Bible were in circulation. The Jesuits secured at Rome a condemnation of the attitude of the Puritans, as we shall see, but they were near their own ignominious fall, and in any case France was now passing into the era of Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists.

In the last part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth century there appeared in many countries an agitation for the formation, on the English model, of Bible Societies. It is one of the jokes of the Syllabus of 1864 that these Bible Societies are classed with such pernicious movements as Socialism, Communism, and Secularism. They were frequently and very emphatically condemned by Rome. Pius VII wrote in 1816 that he had been "horrified on hearing of this most wicked invention." With the usual flagrant lack of unity Catholics subscribed in England to the funds of the Bible Society while the Pope anathematized it in Rome. It is natural to suggest that these Bible Societies distributed Protestant editions of the Bible and therefore the Pope was bound to condemn them. But Catholics were already strictly forbidden to touch Protestant Bibles, and there is a fervor about these Papal maledictions which strongly suggests that what horrified them was the prospect of large bodies of the laity reading the Bible and realizing the vast distance between the teaching of Galilee and the teaching of Rome.

I may say, in fine, that there is very little difference of importance between the Revised Version of the English and American Churches and the Douai English translation used by Catholics. As a young priest I had a course of Syriac at Louvain University which was supposed to make me competent to defend the Catholic translation against the Protestant by being able to appeal to the ancient Syrian manuscripts. I found the comparison of texts almost a purely academic matter. It is not in the least on refinements of phrases that the danger to Rome of reading the Bible depends. It is on the general story of Jesus as a reformer who scorned ritual and arrogant and wealthy priests and had no dogmas. Hence the simple fact is that the Church prevented the laity from reading the Bible as long as and wherever it could and then gave them annotated Bibles which distracted their minds from the plain meaning. It does not find even this necessary today. The overwhelming majority of Catholics have no desire to read the Bible, and the few who do read it are of the

type that swallows without hesitation the egregious theory that only a small part of what Jésus said is set forth in the gospels: that he also communicated the whole design of the Roman Church privately to the apostles!

CHAPTER VII

THE NEW ROME AND ITS PROHIBITIONS

IF any of my readers are scholars, as I hope they are, they may have deprecated my occasional lack of respect for scholarly or academic writings: for the works of certain professors of history and those amateurs who strain to reach their austere standard, who prefix to their books a twenty-page bibliography (mainly borrowed from other people's bibliographies) of books which are on the whole inaccessible to the reader and pack their pages with facts of no genuine interest and certainly no utility. If you deliberately decline to follow this learned fashion, you are deemed superficial and flippant, a mere popularizer. We can all understand how it is as useful for a few experts to collect all the historical facts on a particular subject, such as the Index, as for a geologist to collect all the facts on fossil Ammonites or Labyrinthodons. The store may at times be visited by general historians; though I find it interesting that the one thorough work on the Index (Reusch) in the British National Library—that is to say, in one of the chief European shrines of scholars—for the last fifty years, had still many pages uncut until I cut them the other day. But the disadvantage of this kind of writing is that the significance of the facts is lost upon the great majority of readers and is often not perceived by the writers themselves.

The point impresses one very particularly in connection with histories of the Index, and I have already shown how a very wide and learned command of the facts is consistent with entirely false estimates of their value and meaning, which ought to be the chief concern of the historian. I have illustrated this by reference to the work of my friend, the late Dr. Putnam, which is in the main an English translation of Reusch, because the American reader who takes any interest in the Index has probably found himself restricted to that book and it is everywhere recommended as a reliable authority. I have to repeat at this stage that it is not only not reliable as an account of the conduct of Rome in regard to censorship in the seventeenth century but is extremely misleading. The general picture suggested is that a Church purified in its morals and improved in its scholarship by the stern lesson of the preceding century now watched the world's literature more conscientiously and more sagaciously than ever, and that Spain and Italy at least looked respectfully to the Papacy or to the bishops and Jesuits for guidance. It is a false picture. The historical truth is that, when the Papacy failed to recover its lost provinces by the Thirty Years' War which it inspired, it settled down, amidst an increasing moral, intellectual and economic decay, to guard its

remaining dominion by a censorship of which one can say only that it reflects the intellectual poverty which it succeeded in producing.

Let us first consider what is presented to us as the chief sign of sincerity in the work of the Congregation of the Index after the year 1600, its prohibition in increasing numbers of indecent books. It remains true in the seventeenth century that while the general reading public almost confined itself to a literature (memoirs, novels, poems, etc.) which would in very large part not pass the censorship of a modern state, and was at least predominantly erotic, the Index is predominantly occupied with theological and heretical works. Over the latter I will not waste our time. No one is now interested in the Protestant writers of the seventeenth century or the Catholic writers (except a few like Galileo whom we take later) who are supposed to have stumbled into heresy. I take it at least that my reader will not care for me to discuss the merits or demerits of such writers as Nevizanus, Vatablus, Pirkheimer, Cornarius, etc., or to learn the dates on which they were condemned, or of the successive revisions of the Index, or the procedure by which the owls of the Vatican decided that they were heretics.

I need say only that the work was not much more intelligently done than in the preceding century. There are gross errors in spelling, and it is clear that the censors have never seen many of the books they condemn. Catholic scholars continue to speak with scorn of them. Holtenius, one of the most learned Catholic writers of the first half of the seventeenth century, was appointed a Consultor to the Congregation of the Index. He attended one sitting, and he says in his letters that when he heard one of the cardinals, who in Rome was counted a scholar, urge that all literature except works on theology and law ought to be suppressed, he refused to attend again. It was, he wrote to a friend in 1633, "a conspiracy of ignorant censors against good literature." Genuine scholars were afraid to raise their heads in Rome, but he begs his correspondent never to repeat what he says or he will be punished. In a letter of the year 1636 (in Reusch) he tells a friend that the Vatican has, to make money, hired out its printing press, of which we hear so much in the sixteenth century, for \$2500 a year, and has now, as no one will rent it, sold it to Cardinal Borghese. In 1644 he is still writing that "all branches of literature and learning are disdained" at Rome.

So much for the new scholarship of Rome. And this general disdain of what the French call *belles lettres* (poetry, fiction, literary essays, etc.) suggests that the increase in the number of books condemned as "against morals" may not necessarily mean that there is a more refined moral sense at the Vatican. It would be useless to give here the names of the authors, for not one of them is known today. Perhaps a couple of score of popular works of poetry, stories, and collections of jokes were put on the Index as obscene. One could still read Rabelais or Boccaccio (with his nuns turned into countesses) in any part of the Catholic world, and one wonders whether these obscurer men may not have been chiefly guilty of reflections on the love-affairs of the clergy. That the selection was at least in great part influenced in this sense is clear when we find the censors choosing out of the very lively English literature of the time

an obscure work like Joseph Owen's "Epigrams" (certainly naughty but also anti-Roman) and (later) Laurence Sterne's "Sentimental Journey." No doubt many erotic works were put on the Index as such at least when they were written by priests. One such author was a Camaldulense monk, another a Carthusian, a third a well known Venetian nun. One occupied one of the most distinguished offices at the Vatican, another was the highest authority in Rome on Papal ceremonies, another a professor of theology and an abbot. It would hardly be surprising if Rome refused to tolerate people of this kind publishing erotic poems and novels while it pretended to the rest of Europe that it had, since Trent, raised the moral standard of its clergy.

But there is another detail amongst the few given by Reusch about this class of literature (entirely omitted by Putnam) which opens up an aspect of the Papacy in the seventeenth century of some importance. It is that some of the chief of these writers who were condemned as immoral were servants either of the Vatican or of the leading cardinals. The most important was Marini, who was considered the best Italian poet of the seventeenth century. We read that Paul V put him in prison for the obscenity of some of his poetry but that he succeeded in conciliating the Pope by a new poem. He then entered the household of Cardinal Aldobrandini, nephew of Clement VIII, and he held a high place in clerical society in the first quarter of the seventeenth century. It was only after his death that the most erotic of his poems were put on the Index. Cardinal Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII, was the second patron of Marini. Stigliani, another writer condemned on moral grounds, was in the service of Cardinal Borghese. Bronzini was in the service of Cardinal Palletta. We at once suspect that the age of nepotism and of cardinalial laxity had by no means disappeared from Rome, and, as I find I have in my History dealt quite inadequately with the morals of the Papal court in the seventeenth century, let me reproduce here a few details which will enable the reader to judge for himself whether it was now at least an austere institution conscientiously guarding the souls of the faithful from the taint of heresy. At the close of his third volume Leopold von Ranke gives a very valuable collection of contemporary documents; though, unfortunately, he leaves them almost entirely in Italian, and he omits most passages relating to morals in the stricter sense.

From these documents it is quite clear that there had been no moral improvement of the Roman and Italian character. I have already said that the only change in this respect that I can detect after the supposed Counter-Reformation is that the cardinals and prelates no longer openly flaunted their mistresses and children, gambled for enormous sums, and bribed each other with hundreds of thousands of dollars to get the tiara. Ranke dislikes to discuss these things and the documents he uses are unpublished, so we cannot be very positive, but I assume that in the Rome of the seventeenth century it was not possible to live quite as loosely as cardinals had lived from about 1450 to 1550. I have already mentioned a fact, the corruption of the Dominican order and the protection of this corruption by a Papal Nuncio and the Dominican General, which suggests that Rome was not really very zealous about chastity. In all other moral respects we have a mass of evidence that Rome in the

seventeenth century was as corrupt as ever and was ruled by Papal nephews of scandalous luxury and no moral delicacy.

Sixtus V was the last Pope of the sixteenth century at whose character I glanced in a previous chapter. He was, we saw, a flagrant nepotist, his cardinal nephew rising to an income of about a quarter of a million dollars a year. This—and Sixtus is supposed to have completed the work of purification—set a standard for the next century. Three Popes followed him in two years and had not time to settle down. Then came Clement VIII, whom Ranke describes as a pious, virtuous, and very industrious Pope; but in the thirteen years of his pontificate he distributed more than \$5,000,000 (worth four or five times as much in our money) amongst his relatives. His nephew, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini, was all-powerful in Rome and sold every office and appointment. Simony was almost as rife as ever, and men even bought from the Pope's nephew certificates which gave them immunity against creditors or were allowed to escape justice by the use of perjured witnesses. Cardinal Aldobrandini had an income of a quarter of a million dollars. His rival, Cardinal Farnese, was as rich and had a private army of three hundred horse. Time and again they were on the point of a civil war of the fifteenth-century type. The election that followed the death of Clement was as passionate a struggle as such elections had been in the old days, and the tiara fell to the richest cardinal, Borghese; who is, nevertheless, described as stern and virtuous.

The scandal of these incomes cannot be appreciated unless we glance at Papal finance. Several Italian provinces had been added to the Papal States since the Reformation, and the Pope's income rose from about \$3,500,000 in 1590 to about \$5,000,000 in 1835. But the expenditure was such that in the same period the public debt rose from about sixteen million to about seventy-five million dollars. War (financing the struggle against heretics, etc.) and the erection of monuments and buildings in Rome absorbed most of this money, but nearly every Pope who rose to the throne enriched his family and added to the greedy and violent aristocracy. Urban VIII raised his Barberini family to the rank and wealth of the Aldobrandini, the Borghese, etc., three nephews having incomes of quarter of a million each. Near the end of his long pontificate Urban affected scruples about his nepotism and appointed a special commission to advise him on the subject: though it was settled, Dr. Putnam says, and nepotism abolished by the Council of Trent. The commission, of course, found that a Pope, being a temporal monarch, had every right to enrich and ennoble his family, and would not err if he gave even his nieces quarter of a million dollars a year. The General of the Jesuit Society confirmed the decision. Urban was Pope for twenty-one years, and some of the impatient cardinals made two attempts to have him assassinated: once by the medieval magic of making and melting a wax image of him, involving the aid of the devil, and once by poisoning the host he was to use in the mass. A more pleasant picture of the time is given us by the Venetian ambassador at Rome. There was, he reported, an epidemic of fictitious illness amongst the cardinals. They developed coughs, took to their beds, and so on. The idea was that the sickliest of them had the best chance of election at the next Conclave, for the cardi-

nals were not going to elect another man who would hold the profitable office for twenty years.

In a word, while we may miss a few of the more picturesque vices of the Papal Court of Renaissance days, and the Popes themselves were generally careful if not virtuous, there was no moral improvement. Elegant courtesans may not have flourished as much as formerly, but even Ranke acknowledges a "universal degeneracy." Rome and the Legations (the provinces nearest to Rome) then probably had a total population of a few hundred thousand, certainly not more than a sixth of the population of Chicago today. Yet Ranke tells us that it is on record that there were every year in the area, under the Pope's eyes, more than a thousand murders, or more than twice as many as there are in Chicago today. The economic distress, the insecurity of life and property, and the ravages of disease were such that the population of Italy steadily sank. The streets of the towns were deadly in their filth, and the clerical administration was wholly corrupt. Even in Rome, in spite of the wealth of Pope-made nobles and the Church, the population increased by less than 10 per cent in half a century.

And this situation was not merely found under "a few bad Popes," as the Catholic is apt to say; indeed Catholic historians do not admit that any Popes after 1550 were "bad." It was the chronic condition of Rome and the Papal States in the seventeenth century. Innocent X, who succeeded Urban, so enriched his family and angered Rome during eleven years that when he died his corpse lay untended in the Vatican for three days, until a priest gave a man a dollar to attend to it. His sister-in-law, a robust and insatiably greedy woman, was permitted to rule Rome and sell all offices, and the rumors spread in Rome that the Pope had incestuous relations with her. Ranke warmly denies this, and it is only an inference; but it is curious that the Venetian ambassadors reported that before his elevation Innocent had been chiefly devoted to "knightly exercises and the pleasures of love." It is admitted that he owed his advancement chiefly to his sister-in-law's money. His successor, Alexander VII, another "pious" man, is said to have "carried nepotism to its highest pitch": with the encouragement of the General of the Jesuits Clement IX, who followed him, also enriched his relatives. The plea of the Jesuits, repeated by modern Catholic writers, was that foreign powers preferred to deal with ministers who were related to the Pope. The fact is—again see the scores of documents in Ranke—that from every part of the Catholic world there came criticisms of Rome almost as violent as those that had assailed it before the Reformation. A French Catholic wrote a pamphlet entitled "The Prostitution of Rome"; and it is again significant that, while Ranke seems to suppress passages relating to sexual morals in his Italian documents, he admits that this author proposes that the Pope ought to marry, to avoid worse evils. The misery of Italy increased as the century wore on, and there were bitter satirical odes on the hypocrisy of the Pope and the greed of the cardinals and prelates.

It is surely a normal and proper part of an historian's business to show that this is the real character of the Rome that plunged Europe into the horrors of the Thirty Years War and brought shame upon the

intellect of Italy by putting the works of Galileo, Bruno and Copernicus on the Index. The Congregation of the Index consisted of, in the words of the Catholic Holstenius, a group of ignorant priests and monks, place-seekers in a corrupt administration, under the lead of cardinals who had little interest in their offices, as a rule, beyond the pay. These were the men who told the Catholics of Italy that they must not read translations of the significant works which were appearing in Europe: of Lord Bacon and Sir Thomas Browne, Montaigne and La Fontaine, Hobbes and Grotius, Descartes and Spinoza. Grammars and literary manuals in various languages were put on the Index because they gave illustrations of style from authors like Montaigne and Bacon. Encyclopaedic works were frequently condemned, especially if they included astronomy. Few historical works could pass, as they were bound to conflict with the peculiar Roman version of the history of Europe. The French Chancellor D'Agneau, a strict Catholic, spoke with contempt of the Roman congregations of cardinals. This Index, he said in 1710, was despised in France, which had "clung to the ancient ecclesiastical freedom." In 1712 the Roman "conciliabulum," as he called it, put a decree of the Paris Parlement in the Index. "It has thus," said D'Agneau, "obtained a place of honor beside other decrees defending our fundamental privileges, which Rome has canonized by condemning them." We shall see in a later chapter how the censorship worked in France.

It is usual in works on the Index to devote a section to the condemnation of Galileo and other scientific writers, but I have dealt with the subject elsewhere and need give here only a few facts about the condemnation of Copernican works by the Index Congregations. Already in 1616 that Congregation, which issued periodical supplements to the Index, published a decree suspending the works of Copernicus and ruling that "the doctrine of the double motion of the earth about its axis and about the sun, is false and entirely contrary to Holy Scripture." This was a general intimation that it was forbidden to read or publish any works which followed the Copernican theory, and it followed a special warning of Galileo by the Inquisition. Italian authorities dispute the orthodox statement that Galileo solemnly promised not to write on the subject, but that does not concern us here. Catholic attempts to show that Galileo was condemned for other reasons than holding the Copernican theory are quite useless when we find the Congregation of the Index decreeing in 1616 that all Copernican works were forbidden, condemning Kepler's "Epitome of Copernican Astronomy" in 1619, ordering in 1620 that the work of Copernicus shall be "corrected" by representing the movement of the earth as a mere hypothesis, and again in 1624 prohibiting all Copernican literature. Moreover, the Inquisition expressly declared, in its condemnation of Galileo, that the proposition that the sun "does not revolve round the earth" is "heretical, because expressly contrary to Holy Scripture," and, as we shall now see, the Congregation of the Index continued for nearly two hundred years to prohibit all works adopting the Copernican theory.

Galileo was condemned by the Inquisition in the summer of 1633. On August 23rd, 1634, the Congregation of the Index issued a new list of condemned books, and it contained Galileo's "Dialogues." The ground

of the condemnation of the Dialogues is not stated, but the same decree condemns a Copernican work by Foscarini and "all other books that teach the same thing." This general prohibition of works which taught that the earth moves around the sun remained in the Index until the renovation of that ancient and disreputable instrument by Pope Benedict XIV in 1757. Still, however, though the general prohibition was withdrawn, the works of Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo remained in the Index. This fact is generally omitted, as Benedict is supposed to have made the Index intellectually respectable, at least from a Catholic point of view, whereas he left these founders of astronomy on the Index at a time when the science had made such progress that the central position of the sun was now a platitude. Reusch shows, and Dr. Putnam admits, that the names of Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler and Foscarini, remained on the Index until 1835, when a new edition omitted them. It was only thirteen years before that date, in 1822, that the Vatican consented to surrender its stupid obstinacy and permit Catholics to teach the elementary truths of astronomy.


The great French astronomer Lalande had begged Rome in 1765 to strike the name of Galileo from the Index, and the request was refused. In the nineteenth century, however, the position of Rome in this respect became intolerable. Catholic writers sometimes say that Pope Pius VII repealed the condemnation of Copernican works spontaneously in 1818. Even this is incorrect. In 1820 a clerical professor of astronomy at Rome, Canon Settele, wrote an elementary text book of his science on the received Copernican lines. The authorities refused to give it the necessary license unless he, in the old medieval style, said that it was a mere hypothesis that the earth revolved round the sun. He appealed to the Pope, and the Pope solemnly referred the matter to the Inquisition. It still took Rome months to come to a decision, but the cynical comments of the world forced it to bend its stiff neck. In 1822 the Congregation of the Index ruled that henceforward Catholics were free to publish and read works on Copernican lines. Until then, in every Catholic school and college in the world, teachers had been compelled to say that the earth was the center of the solar system, if not the universe! It was still thirteen years before the Congregation of the Index had the courage and common sense to remove the names of Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo.

Dr. Putnam offsets this monumental piece of calculated ignorance and repression of intellectual life by adding that "the divines in the Protestant Church were no more favorable than were the Catholic theologians to the Copernican theory of the universe." There is not the least comparison. Protestant theologians of the sixteenth century were certainly as eloquent as Catholics in denouncing the new view as unscriptural, but Protestant opposition yielded rapidly to evidence: to say nothing of the fact that it never forced astronomers, on their knees, to abjure the truth. In the seventeenth century it was in Protestant countries that astronomy advanced, and in the eighteenth century one finds merely a conservative theologian here and there who held out for the central earth. The unique feature of the Catholic position is that it enforced its condemnation with the terrors of the Inquisition, and that as late as the second decade of the

nineteenth century it insisted on the teaching of a more palpable scientific error in every college and university of the Catholic world. To this there is not the slightest parallel in the opposition to Copernicus by early Protestant theologians. But after what I have said about the real moral and intellectual condition of Rome in the seventeenth century the reader will not be surprised. Most of its "scholars" were in the position of the Irishman who said that, if the Church ordered it, he would believe, not merely that the whale swallowed Jonah, but that Jonah swallowed the whale. The majority of its members neither knew nor cared what astronomers were saying in the world at large. At the best we can suppose only that there were some even at Rome who knew the truth but feared the consequences of acknowledging a grave error. But that is merely another symptom of lack of intelligence and statesmanship. Educated Catholics were not shocked, but immensely relieved, when the Vatican abandoned its pretentious blunder, and uneducated Catholics, or the few of them who ever hear what the Congregation of the Index does, took no more notice than they would do if it had been announced that the Pope had a new cat.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOME CURIOSITIES OF THE INDEX

 ONE of the most interesting aspects of the study of the Index in its earlier stages of the general work of the Congregation of the Index is that it throws a weird light on the complexion of the Catholic world itself. Now that I have shown that the Counter-Reformation was for the most part a hollow sham, and that the real purpose of the Index was to prevent critical ideas from reaching the minds of Catholics, the reader will fully expect that the eccentricities of the Middle Ages lingered in the sheltered Catholic countries. I mentioned a few in the course of preceding chapters. You remember how certain cardinals, feeling that Pope Urban VIII clung to life and the Papal palace longer than a Pope is supposed to do, got their servants to set up a wax image of him and, with imprecations to the evil spirits, pray that the Pope's life would melt away with the melting of the image. There was still a great deal of black magic of every sort in Catholic countries. A few works on the subject were put on the Index, but Reusch shows that other complete manuals of magic, or of the art of obtaining things through the agency of devils and spells, circulated freely. The Index conducted its work here with its usual inconsistency or slovenliness. It condemned a work on the divining rod, which was then supposed to discover hidden treasure and detect murderers as well as find water, but it gave immunity to manuals which taught men all the secrets of the black art.

The belief in the activity of devils remained as vivid as it had been in the Middle Ages or in ancient Babylon, but in Protestant countries the belief decayed as science advanced, and there was a good deal of merri-

ment about Catholic practices. It was this Protestant mockery, as Reusch shows, that compelled the Congregation of the Index to suppress a large number of pamphlets, pictures, objects, and practices of which it would otherwise have taken no notice. The reader who hesitates to believe that there was much more progress in enlightenment in Protestant than in Catholic countries may be reminded of two very significant differences: the vast army of monks and nuns which spread over every Catholic region and had to make a living out of it, and the peculiar fiscal system of the Vatican itself. Comparing such figures as are available for France, Italy, and Spain I find that there were at least 100,000 monks and nuns to every five million adults, or at least three-quarters of a million monks and nuns at any given time in the four or five generally impoverished Catholic countries. The practices which I am going to describe, since it is the Congregation of the Index that brings them to our notice, were very largely money-making tricks of the monks and nuns.

In black magic as such, or the invocation of the help of the demons, we should expect very few of them to be involved, but it was quite a different matter to promise folk, for a consideration, protection from the demons and all the maladies and other evils which they caused. The chief method was exorcism, and the monks had almost as rich a literature as the Chaldaean priests had had two thousand years earlier. Scores of these extraordinary collections of imprecations (entitled "Scourge of the Devils," and so on) were so ridiculed by Protestant writers that they had to be condemned. The charm often consisted of a meaningless string of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew words which were probably as little understood by the exorcist as by the victim and his trembling neighbors. The friar would stand over the sick or insane person who was supposed to be possessed by the devil and sonorously reel off a long series of words like Hel, Helovm, Heloa, Cheye, Tetragrammaton, Adonay, Saday, Sabaoth, Soter, Emmanuel, Hagios, Ischyros, etc. Some are taken from the Greek liturgy, some (through the Cabbalists) from the Hebrew. In other cases the charm was recited while a wax figure of the demon was burned with sulphur, certain herbs, and foul-smelling resin. Competition in the business led to the production of more and more elaborate recipes and incantations. The Index by no means condemned all the works which were used in this branch of religious science, and during two centuries the populations which flattered themselves that they had retained the priceless treasure of the true faith suffered appalling misery for its reliance on charms, prayers, blessed objects, the intercession of saints and the virtue of monks. In the Papal States of the seventeenth century the population, in spite of a teeming birth-supply and little war, actually decreased by one-third in forty years. It was worse in Spain. After the defeat of the Moors and Catholicization of the whole country the population steadily sank from thirty million to eight million people. Try to imagine the reign of disease that led to so appalling a death-rate. But the monks and nuns prospered everywhere.

Competition between monks of rival orders and even individuals of the same order led to an increase of eccentricity and forgery. About the beginning of the seventeenth century Clement VIII summoned to

his court at Rome an affair that was being heatedly discussed in the Spanish Church. Some workmen demolishing an ancient tower at Granada had found a leaden box containing a piece of cloth, a bone, and a roll of parchment. The message on the parchment, which was in Arabic, purported to have been written by a priest of the first or second century, and it explained that the bone was from the leg of St. Stephen, while the linen was part of the handkerchief with which Mary had wiped her tears at the foot of the cross. The earliest Christian missionaries to Spain (as described in the fictitious Roman history of the Church) had brought these valuable relics with them. The fraud was so successful and profitable that another parchment was soon discovered, a work of St. John in Arabic, Greek, and Latin; rather a feat for a Galilean fisherman, but it was received with reverence. Next leaden tablets and parchments, with messages in Arabic, were found in various places, authenticating, and therefore greatly raising the market price of, certain disputed relics.

But in some of these tablets the immaculate conception of Mary was accepted, and this led to trouble; besides that monks and priests had always very sound reason to suspect each other's discoveries. The trouble was not that dogmas should be clearly formulated in the Church of the first century. Everybody had so gross an idea of early Church history that they could believe anything of that nature. The trouble was that in the seventeenth century this myth of the immaculate conception was fierily disputed by the rival bodies of friars. The Dominican friars rejected it—one did not find it in Thomas Aquinas—while the Franciscans defended it. The Church was neutral, the Congregation of the Index being content to punish only works in which the merits of Mary were stated in a form which provoked ribald Protestant laughter or in which the monks indulged in too violent language against each other. However, for this and other reasons the discoveries in Spain led to most unedifying controversies, though the Archbishop of Granada had appointed a commission of learned priests which pronounced the tablets and documents genuine.

If Spanish clerical scholars had so far forgotten the elements of the great civilization they had destroyed as not to know that these documents were written in a language in which no one *could* write until many centuries after the time of the apostles, we can imagine how the owls of the Congregation of the Index would regard the matter. Rome, in point of fact, took fifty years to decide that the whole business was a fraud. It then concluded that there was in the documents "much that smelt of Mohammedanism," in the words of the decree. There were, in fact, quotations from the Koran in them. It was a malicious trick played on the Church by Moriscoes, or Moors who were supposed to be converted; probably, scholars think, by the very Moriscoes who were brought to Rome to translate the Arabic texts. The finds were condemned and all literature about them prohibited; and the Spanish Inquisition followed the Roman Index. But this did not prevent priests and monks continuing to make similar discoveries, especially for the glory of the Virgin, in the eighteenth century. Other frauds defied the Roman authorities, or they thought it prudent to overlook them. At

Messina in the year 1621 someone had "discovered" a letter which the Virgin Mary had written to the inhabitants of Mëssina in the first century! The Index condemned some books on the subject (without saying a word about the fraud itself) and permitted others. The Vatican was silent when the Sicilians in Rome celebrated every year their patriotic feast of Our Lady of the Letter, and when a special chapel was consecrated to her in the cathedral at Messina.

These instances will give the reader an idea how mercilessly the appalling credulity of the Catholic countries was exploited by the priests and monks, and I must crush hundreds of other types of fraud into a few paragraphs. They concern us here because it is from the Index itself that we know them, and because the mental conditions which permitted such outrages were mainly due to the Index itself or the suppression of critical literature. One very extensive branch of the new industry, which flourished even more after the Reformation, was the sale of bogus indulgences. After the year 1600 we find the Congregation of the Index denouncing large numbers of books and pamphlets announcing indulgences which were either wholly or in part fraudulent. The Catholic historian generally tells how the Council of Trent (which, we saw, expressly avoided denouncing the sale of indulgences) solemnly decreed that all abuses must cease, and he represents that the matter ended there. On the contrary, the Popes themselves created in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries "an immense number and variety of indulgences," as Reusch says, and a money-payment was in one way or other commonly connected with these. I have told how the Popes confirmed the sale of indulgences (bulas) in Spain and Spanish America, but this was only one way of acquiring money. An even more blatant trick—so blatant, in fact, that the Index had to try to suppress it—was to sell to the people a piece of paper of the exact size and shape of the Virgin's foot or of the spear-wound in the side of Jesus. The dimensions had been communicated in a revelation to a pious religious or, according to another version, had been copied from the authentic slipper of the Virgin which had been brought from Constantinople, in a gold box, to the court of Charlemagne and was preserved in the cathedral at Saragossa. The pamphlets recommending the purchase of these objects declared that Pope John XXII had granted rich indulgences to those who kissed them, and, though this gave the Index a pretext to declare them forgeries, Pope John had been so unscrupulous a money-grabber that I wonder. In any case, the condemnation did not stop the sale. Reusch found the objects on sale at fairs in Catholic Germany in the second half of the nineteenth century. The purchaser was supposed to be guarded against various diseases and accidents.

It may occur to you that at least Rome showed some degree of zeal to curb the fraud, as large numbers of these bogus indulgences, relics, charms, prayers, etc., were condemned. Pray remember three things: that the Vatican got no profit out of these provincial inventions, that Protestant criticism at least penetrated to South Germany, Poland, France, and Belgium, and that rival bodies of monks and clergy constantly denounced each other's work to the Index. Competition raised the promise of the indulgence until from a relief from the fires of purgatory for

twelve thousand or eighty thousand years (these were sold in Rome) the figure ran up to fourteen million years, or the paper promised you as many years off your punishment in the divine prison as there are stars in the sky, grains of sand on the shore, or blades of grass in the fields. In Poland, which was not quite closed against heretical observers, the monks sold pictures of Mary with the authentic prayer she uttered when the dead Christ was laid in her arms, and a guarantee was given that if you recited the prayer you delivered fifteen souls out of purgatory or insured the conversion of any fifteen sinners you cared to specify. Other indulgences—prayers (of which, of course, you bought your copy) were authentic prayers of Jesus himself, of which copies had been found in his tomb or in the tomb of St. Peter at Rome.

Perhaps I have already told enough to be able to suggest, without the suspicion of prejudice, that the action of the Index is generally discoverable in connection with enterprises in which Rome itself had no share or when the laughter of heretics became too embarrassing. As the overwhelming majority of the faithful were carefully "protected" from heretical literature I do not attach very much importance to the second motive, except in Germany. The rivalry of the vendors was probably the chief cause of condemnations. When, for instance, the brown friars brought the immaculate conception of Mary into their frauds, the Dominican friars readily denounced them. But the Church could not condemn the doctrine itself—it did not officially adopt it until the nineteenth century—and, as it grew popular, it had remarkable extensions. Ecstatic nuns naturally preferred male patrons, and the supposed father of Jesus, Joseph, had his turn. He also was said to have been immaculately conceived; but that was too much for the Index authorities. Then Mary's mother, Anne, was glorified. Was she not, as a Catholic work (on the Index) of the seventeenth century called her, the mother-in-law of the Holy Ghost and the grandmother of God? So she also must have had a virgin-mother. The Franciscans, being the special champions of Mary, wrote weird accounts of her privileges, and the Dominicans referred their books to the Index.

It must not be thought that the Dominican friars were opposed to the cult of Mary. On the contrary, it was they who had invented the rosary, or chain of beads, which the Catholic tells off to count his prayers to Mary. To their great annoyance the sons of St. Francis also adopted this profitable invention, for every Catholic has to buy a "set of beads," at more than cost price on account of the blessing. What was worse, a holy Spanish nun of the seventeenth century, a Franciscan nun, was wafted to heaven in her ecstasy, and Jesus himself blessed her beads. As the virtue was communicated to all beads which touched them, these were much more efficacious than ordinary blessed rosaries; besides that little biographies of the saintly nun were sold with them. The angry Dominicans got the Roman Index and the Spanish Inquisition to condemn the whole development. But they in turn poached on the preserves of the Franciscans. It is part of the legend of St. Francis that he had miraculous nail-wounds (like Jesus after crucifixion) in his hands and feet. In the seventeenth century the Index had to deal with com-

plants that the Dominicans were exhibiting pictures and statues of *their* patron with wounds in the hands and feet.

And both the begging orders complained of Jesuits, Benedictines, and others. The Benedictine monks sold medals which were sure charms against devils; they guarded you from disease and, if you hung one up in the dairy, the devil could not prevent you from churning your milk into butter. The Jesuits wrote prayers on bits of paper, to be swallowed by patients or even by your hens if they did not lay regularly. A Neapolitan Jesuit did a great business in these commodities, but his rivals warned the authorities that he was bringing a bale to Rome, and it was confiscated at the Custom House. The Jesuits were reported also for interpolating glorifications of aristocratic families in the notices of saints in the mass-books. For the feast of St. Catherine of Siena they inserted a fraudulent statement that she was related to the Borghese family, and that ruffianly crowd and their Jesuit confessors made a spirited fight for their saint when rivals reported then to the Congregation of Rites. Then there were the societies or fraternities and sororities which the monks created, whether from piety or to keep the laity more attached to themselves. One was the League of the Slaves of Mary, whose members carved rich bogus indulgences by going about in public with chains on their necks and arms. Rome concluded that it had never granted the indulgences—I doubt if by this time it could really tell which of these innumerable tricks it *had* authorized—and condemned the slaves. Another league earned indulgences by wearing copies of the girdle of St. Augustine's mother, Monica. But you must read the learned Reusch and the authorities he gives if you wish to know the whole story.

I have long noticed that the friends of mine who urge me to see rather the "simple piety" of these things never read any adequate account of them and never study the temper and conduct of the monks and clergy who purveyed these things. They fought each other truculently over the most trivial details. The Franciscan order, for instance, had split with two branches, and in the seventeenth century they had an amazing fight as to which of them had the correct form of the costume that had been worn by Francis of Assisi, especially in regard to the hood or cowl that is drawn over the head. The monks of one branch got Papal permission (probably after bribery) to show statues of the great saints of the order, Francis and Antony, in *their* style of dress, and the rival brethren got a Papal permit to show the saints in *their* dress. Each side sold to the people little statues and pictures, and there was terrible quarreling, and several books were put on the Index for their bad language. Other prohibited works contain mutual criticisms of the costumes of the various orders. Rival orders for redeeming captives fought truculently, and the bodies of monks watched each other's saints very zealously. The Franciscans boasted of a marvelous Spanish nun of theirs, Maria de Agreda, whose revelations from above were incorporated in a work entitled "The Mystic City of God." It is a wild flight of a neurotic female imagination, and it was clearly touched up, if not written, by the monks. The Dominicans denounced it to the Congregation of the Index, and it decided to prohibit the book. The Fran-

ciscans get the Spanish government to threaten the Vatican, and the quarrel about the serene wisdom of the saintly nun went on for years. There were various cases of the kind. One effect of the partial success, after Trent, of the Church in introducing chastity into nunneries was to direct the energy of crowds of nuns into ecstasies and revelations which give the Index considerable trouble.

Historians who insist that the Middle Ages ended at least with the year 1600 do not take the trouble to determine exactly what progress there had been in Spain, Portugal, Poland, and Italy—we might almost add Ireland, Bavaria, and Belgium—which justifies us in claiming that they had passed into a new era. To the year 1750 at least there was no such advance. The mental and moral complexion was as medieval as the material. The streets of such cities as Rome and Madrid, unpaved, unlit, and undrained, were as squalid as they had been in the thirteenth century; the same coaches and litters, carts and ox-wagons, passed along them; and there was not the least improvement in law and police, in municipal administration, or in political government. In all these respects there had been rather decay than advance since the fifteenth century. Crime was as rife and cruel, and the quaint practices I have described surely show that neither in the educated minority nor the uneducated majority had there been the least progress since the fifteenth century.

The plain truth is that those many features of the Middle Ages which we rightly consider as below the common level of civilization were so peculiarly connected with the rule of the Papacy—in plainer but quite just language, with the exploitation of the people by Catholic priests and monks—that they lingered in exact proportion as the rule of the Church remained undisturbed. In Italy, for instance, it was the Papal States that most faithfully preserved these medieval conditions until the middle of the nineteenth century. The revolutionary and Napoleonic period saw a little advance, as the rule of the Papacy was threatened, but with the restoration of security the Popes took their kingdom back into the Middle Ages. You find these conditions preserved in exact proportion to the survival unchallenged of the rule of the priests; fully preserved in South America, almost fully (until recent times) in Quebec, Portugal, Spain, Poland, Ireland, and Naples, much less preserved in Austria (with a large Protestant population), and least of all in France. You will find illiteracy lingering in just the same proportion.

But probably few non-Catholics realize to what a prodigious extent the Church of Rome contrives to sustain these things amongst its members even in Protestant countries. Reusch tells us how he found the Virgin's-foot indulgences on sale in modern Germany, at country fairs, but he speaks of another indulgence, the *Partiuncula*, as a thing of the past, whereas it was celebrated every year, with great publicity, at the Franciscan church in the suburb of Manchester where I lived fifty years ago, and is probably still celebrated. There has merely been a natural selection of these medieval commodities. It would hardly do to exhibit the Virgin's slipper (as at Saragossa) or the Virgin's nightshirt (as at Chartres) or phials of her milk (lots of places) in Boston or Balti-

more, but you will find college-trained Catholic ladies, and some men, there wearing next to their skins blessed scapulars (little pictures of the Virgin on cloth), Agnus Deis (little wax lambs in pads), and miraculous medals. It is only a few years since, when I was lecturing against religion in Canada, a saintly virgin of Toronto sent me a blessed medal and implored me to wear it. Numbers of these money-making fakes, of which we learn the more outrageous specimens from the decrees of the Congregation of the Index, have actually received a greater extension in recent times. The priest's book of charms still contains the old forms of blessing of marriage beds, churns, vineyards, new boats, houses, etc., and the "holy water" at the door of every Catholic Church is simply a charm against the devil. These things are not merely not dead; they have in such countries as Italy and Spain extended in the nineteenth century to such incongruous practices as driving the devil out of (or blessing) such scientific products as telegraphs, telephones, and railways. Every Catholic accepts the principle of them; and probably every priest regrets the disappearance of that rich field of exploitation which I have illustrated by these few instances taken from the decrees of the Congregation of the Index in the seventeenth century.

CHAPTER IX

BENEDICT XIV REFORMS THE INDEX

THE chief interest of the Index from this point onward is the study of the way in which Rome tried to keep the advancing thought of the world out of its rich preserves and how it has contrived to maintain this medieval and quite shameless institution in modern times and persuade even non-Catholics to speak of it with respect. But this summary expression suggests, perhaps, to the reader a quite false picture of the life and statesmanship of the Church after the Counter-Reformation or the slight alteration of its ways which goes by that name. One is apt to imagine, after reading articles or essays on the Index, that from about 1550 onward the Papacy drew a blue line round the frontiers of the southern lands, watched the literature of the heretical countries beyond, and preserved one half of Europe in the unity of the Catholic faith by listing each new heretical book as it appeared and sternly prohibiting its docile members to read the book. How any scholar can give the least encouragement to this historical fairytale it is difficult to understand.

The truth is that the body of cardinals and clerics who made up the Congregation of the Index at Rome had hardly a better knowledge or understanding of the literature that was now appearing in the non-Latin countries of Europe than an ordinary teacher in the suburbs of Cleveland has today of, let us say, Finnish or Magyar literature. As a rule, their ignorance of everything outside theology and canon law was colossal. English, German, or Dutch works were occasionally brought to their notice, haphazard, and they seem to have taken for granted that

any book appearing in those countries ought to go on the Index. There was not the least approach to an intelligent survey of the world's literature and a careful selection of the more influential and more effective works. The Index remained until the time of Benedict XIV, as far as non-Catholic literature is concerned, an hotchpotch of corrupted and largely unrecognizable foreign names or titles of books which, for the far greater part, an Italian or a Spaniard could not have obtained at any price if he so desired. Even after Benedict XIV there was in this respect very little improvement. It had earlier been possible to put on the black list certain important foreign works, of Lord Bacon, Lord Herbert, and Grotius, for instance, because they were written in Latin. Now that laymen no longer wrote in Latin, the Roman and Spanish censors depended mainly on an occasional translation of an English or German book into their own tongues. So Swift's "Tale of a Tub" or Defoe's innocent "Robinson Crusoe" goes on the Index, while the fateful and steady development of thought in serious literature is quite unappreciated.

The supposed unity of the Church under the guidance of the Vatican is just as fanciful as the supposed vigilant statesmanship of the Roman Congregations. In the first place, the authority of the Roman Index was recognized only in a small area of the Catholic world. The Spanish censors, controlling every part of what was still the Spanish empire, accepted or rejected at their pleasure the Roman condemnations of books. They gave the Vatican very clearly to understand, repeatedly, that they neither required nor would accept any guidance in such matters. The French censors were even more defiant. In the whole period from 1600 to 1750 they scoffed at the Roman Congregation and, quite justly, claimed that there was in France a far higher theological scholarship and competence to deal with books about religion than in Italy. We shall see this in the next chapter. But even in Italy the influence of the Papacy or the Index was greatly restricted. It was not at all recognized in the Spanish kingdom of Naples, which comprised the lower one-third of the country. It was drastically curtailed in the Republic of Venice, which was then a considerable area of the north-east, and it could not be strictly enforced in the other cities of northern Italy. The area which was effectively "protected" by the Pope and his costly Congregation was a part of Italy containing between one and two million Catholics, ninety per cent of whom could not read and very few of whom had the least wish or capacity to read heretical works. The fort of the Vatican was very much like a Chinese fort in the early nineteenth century in which wooden guns painted the color of iron were supposed to intimidate an enemy. The truth is that the Index in each of these countries for the next century and a half is packed with literature of Catholic writers whose neutral quarrels, especially when they belong to rival monastic or semi-monastic bodies, find a new outlet in intrigue to get an opponent's work on the black list.

The long and spirited fight that Venice made against the Roman Index will tell us enough about the unity of the Church and the power of the Pope. The Venetian printers, who were amongst the most important in Europe and contributed greatly to the prosperity of the city,

were in the first quarter of the sixteenth century doing a unique work in the production of Greek works, classical and theological, the Hebrew Old Testament and Talmud, Arabic works on mathematics, medicine, and philosophy, and even some Persian literature. In the interest both of state and Church the Venetian government set up a censorship of the works produced, and from the first it resolved to have no interference from Rome, where, in fact, there was no censor competent to deal with this Greek and oriental literature. Venice was quite orthodox and zealous to keep out heresy. It was one of the first cities to draw up an Index, and in the course of the sixteenth century its Inquisition conducted one hundred and thirty-two trials for infringement of the printing and book laws. But it distrusted the ignorance and narrowness of Rome.

The conflict began when, in 1593, the Venetians heard that Pope Clement VIII was preparing an Index that forbade some of their books, yet was to be enforced on the whole Catholic world. The Venetian ambassador at the Vatican made an emphatic protest. The proposed list would, he said, ruin the printing trade of Venice, which was then the finest in Europe, and he submitted that they were quite able to censor the production themselves. There were other Italian protests against the exorbitant list which had been compiled by the Roman Jesuits and Dominicans, and it was a very curtailed list that Clement (the Pope being, as usual, guided by the church) published in 1596. But the Venetians still warmly protested and, as I said, they got very material concessions in the form of "interpretations" of the Pope's decrees. With these alterations Venice accepted the Index, but Rome had also to consent to the demand that no further prohibitions of books by Rome would be valid in the Republic unless they were accepted by the Venetian Inquisition.

There was at the time in Venice a learned monk of the Servite Order, Paolo Sarfi, to whom, rather than to the Pope, the civic authorities looked for guidance during twenty or thirty years. His hostility to Rome and scorn of its scholarship were such that some recent historians conjecture that he was far advanced in skepticism. I see no evidence of more than a recognition that the Papal claims were priestly fictions, and he had the Republic with him in strictly limiting the authority of the Popes. The Jesuits so hated him that there is every reason to believe that they inspired the attack that was later made on his life. However that may be, Venice exercised its own censorship for nearly two hundred years after the publication of the Index of Clement and repeatedly refused to bow to the Roman decision on books. In 1613, for instance, Rome condemned two books by an English Catholic, Thomas Preston, who wrote in Latin and challenged the secular authority of the Popes. Sarfi declared the works sound, and the Venetian Senate accepted his verdict. A few years later Venice put on its black list a work by the Archbishop Spalato, published at Rome and greatly esteemed by the Vatican, and it prohibited also the History of the Council of Trent by Cardinal Pallavicini, which was Rome's reply to Sarfi's very candid and caustic History. After the death of Sarfi the local Inquisition won increasing power and, as he had warned Venice, its book-trade proportionately declined. But there was still more freedom in Venice than Rome, and as late as the end of the

eighteenth century we find it defying Rome in regard to the prohibition of books.

The other cities of north Italy were not so independent as Venice, against which one Pope threatened war, but the Index could not be enforced in them with full rigor. By all the rules of the Roman censors, for instance, Dante's great poem, which put Popes in hell and scorned the most vital Papal claims, ought to have been put on the Index, but was not. No works of Petrarch were ever on the Roman Index (his Sonnets were on the Spanish Index), though his letters give the frankest description in literature of the corruption of the Papal Court in his time, and they were used by every Protestant critic. The Comedies of Ariosto, some of which were amongst the most indecent in any literature, while others satirize the traffic in relics and indulgences at Rome, were never on the Index. It was the same with the entire class of comedies (by Macchiavelli, Cardinal Bibbiena, etc.) of the free years of the Renaissance. Boccaccio's Decameron was put on the Index as "against morals," but the insincerity of the pretext was seen when Gregory XIII approved an expurgated edition in which the sins remained in all their picturesqueness but the sinners were no longer priests, monks, and nuns. Sixtus V put over this edition on the Index, and there it remained, but no notice was taken of the prohibition after the death of Sixtus. The idea of a protection of the faithful from wicked books by a vigilant Papacy is in many respects farcical.

The next blunder—indeed the next important act—of the Roman censorship after the Index of Clement, which was ridiculed outside of Italy, was the publication in 1607 of an Expurgatory Index. The Vatican became at once so anxious to disavow this unfortunate list that it is counted as an unofficial list compiled by the Master of the Sacred Palace, the monk Brasichelli, but he has left it on record that, as one would expect, he was officially instructed to compile it. It was a list of Catholic books that must not be read until they were corrected, and the Roman central houses of the various monastic bodies rang with indignation when they found their writers, even Jesuits, on the list. The Venetians complained that it was used for the purpose of pressing the Papal theory of its power, and scholars grumbled that it made good editions of the Fathers scarcer than ever. Protestants said that it was a trick to suppress genuine editions of the Fathers and substitute adulterated versions. An English Protestant, Thomas James, published in 1612 an elaborate analysis of new Catholic editions of the Fathers, and I must say that he makes out a good case, though he overstates it. He claims to have found 1085 alterations of the genuine text in a Roman edition of the works of Gregory the Great. An Italian expert said that he found thirteen thousand spurious passages. There was certainly much trickery. Putnam quotes a contemporary who saw the proof of an edition of St. Ambrose which two Franciscan monks prepared for the public by making "material changes from the text of the manuscript copy." There is abundant evidence that the Papal censors took great liberties with both the manuscripts submitted to them and the published works that had to be corrected.

During the seventeenth century the Congregation of the Index was

chiefly occupied with works pertaining to the Jesuit-Jansenist controversy in France which I will describe in the next chapter. Here I need note only that the Vatican was so exasperated against the French Church that it put one Catholic writer after another on the Index and even the greater writers of the French Church, of whom the Catholic now boasts, had a narrow escape. Not only were Pascal's "Provincial Letters," the chief works of Descartes, and all the writings of the very zealous and orthodox philosopher Malebranche put on the Index—while the Epicurean Gassendi escaped—but there was talk of condemning such stars of French Catholic learning as Fleury, Tillemont, and Mabillon. The very devout Archbishop Fénelon was actually blacklisted, while the very much less devout Bishop Bossuet was in great favor with the Popes. Rabelais was still read by everybody, but many a modern Catholic would learn with a shock that Rome seriously meditated the condemnation of the famous Bollandist series of Lives of the Saints. One of the editors, the Benedictine monk Petra, in a letter reproduced by the Catholic Dejob in his "Influence of the Council of Trent on Literature," says:

The Congregation appears to object to the work done by the editors of our *Acta* in the correction of errors, but it should understand that, rather than confirm a record of impostures, we prefer to write nothing. The Congregation is giving an opportunity to the heretics to point out the unwillingness of Papists to make corrections or to remedy abuses.

Such were the real domestic relations of the Church and its "eldest daughter" in the seventeenth century. Some of these French scholars, such as Tillemont, were beginning to point out that, as any student of Roman history could tell, the lives of the saints and martyrs of the early Church were in great part impudent forgeries. Rome wanted to close their mouths. It had already effectively closed the ears of its subjects to Protestant criticism.

Pope Alexander VII, the pontiff who called the French "sons of perdition" when he heard that they had been so "mad" as to translate the mass-book into their language, got out, in 1664, the next edition of the Roman Index, incorporating all the periodical prohibitions of the preceding half-century. It was now that Galileo, Copernicus, and Pascal appeared on the Index itself, but the list was still for the most part a crude, one would almost say to a great extent illiterate, string of names, of heretics or imaginary heretics who had been long forgotten, and I will not linger over it. In its supplementary lists after that date the Congregation was still mainly concerned with works on the Jansenist controversy, but the pundits also became aware of the existence of Montaigne's "Essays," Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," Spinoza's "Treatise," and the works of Hobbes. They were, however, still far more interested in those quarrels within the Church in which one side denounced the other to the Index or the Inquisition. A group of very devout mystics in Spain, France and Italy, who were the most religious men and women in their respective countries, were pilloried and punished for the heresy of Quietism.

It was on the charge of succumbing to this terrible heresy that Archbishop Fénelon was drastically condemned and put on the Index. Even

the Roman censors could not at first discover the heresy in his book, but the Pope informed them that Louis XIV, who knew a great deal more about women than theology and merely lent himself to the jealousy and malice of Bossuet, demanded that the book be condemned, and Rome then obligingly found a score of heretical passages in it. The two prelates, one (Fénélon) the most genuinely religious and virtuous priest in France, the other (we now know) with a secret wife of his own and an ardent supporter of the amorous monarch, had enlivened France for some time with their quarrel. There is in the British Museum at London a copy of Bossuet's pamphlet on his rival, and the margins are full of indignant denials of the archbishop himself. When Bossuet heard that Fénélon had not only submitted with profound humility but had presented to his cathedral a piece of gold plate in which the Angel of Truth was represented trampling on his own book, he desired reconciliation, but the king furiously forbade it and deeply humiliated the archbishop. Fénélon had published a pious romance in which Louis saw a satire on his vicious court. Fénélon's agent in Rome pointed out to him that it would be just as easy to find heresy in Bousset's book, but he refused to act.

The next Pope, Clement XI, who was a great scatterer of anathemas—he condemned a book advocating the cult of the Sacred Heart, which is now prominent in every Catholic Church—was equally willing to put his censorship machinery at the service of the corrupt but wealthy and powerful king. The last Jansenist leader, the learned and very religious priest Quesnel, published a quite irreproachable work, approved by the archbishop of Paris, on the New Testament, but the keen scent of the Jesuits detected heresy in it and again urged the king to atone for his earlier vices by purifying the Church—of their enemies. We shall see later what was happening in France. Louis, who was always ready to defy Rome when it suited him, demanded that the Pope should condemn the book. It took the experts in Rome three years to discover heresy in the simply-worded and perfectly orthodox book, and the cardinals were so sensible of the insincerity of the procedure that they begged the Pope not to yield. But Louis XIV had to be obeyed, and in a special Bull the Pope said that Quesnel's book, which was declared sound by many French bishops, contained a hundred and one (note the meticulous accuracy) propositions which were "false, deceitful, injurious to pious ears, godless, blasphemous, and schismatic." Here are samples of these horrible heresies, which the sagacity of Rome detected when the cardinal-archbishop of Paris had failed to see them after most careful scrutiny:

The reading of Scripture is for all.

The Lord's Day should be kept holy by Christians by pious reading, especially of the Holy Scripture.

The sacred obscurity of the Word of God is no reason for the laity to absolve themselves from the reading of it.

We shall see later what happened in France. It is necessary here to note only how Rome proved the superiority of its censorship when France or Spain did condescend to consult it.

The half-century after the publication of this Bull of Clement XI was one of the most fateful to that time in the history of religious thought in Europe. Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopaedists

appeared in France. Deism had a remarkable triumph in the middle and aristocratic classes in England. In Spain and Portugal there slowly gathered the storm which would drive the Jesuits out in shame and disdain. Science made steady and ominous progress. I have said that Rome was really incompetent to realize, and was too lazy to study, the larger movements of thought, but Dr. Putnam redeems it from the reproach that in the three centuries after its "moral and intellectual regeneration" it did not rise above mediocrity even in its Popes by reminding us that from 1740 to 1758 the "great scholar" Benedict XIV presided over the Church, gave it a new literary direction, and reformed its Index. It is quite true that Benedict XIV was a good scholar in the ecclesiastical sense and was ashamed of the literature of his Church. I should add that, though his personal conduct is not questioned, he was a curious type of reformer. In my sketch of him in "Crises in the History of the Papacy," I quoted contemporaries of the highest respectability who found that his conversation was "indecent" and he loved to hear stories about the French court (then at its very loosest) and even cardinals, which today could be told only in smoking rooms. It is curious, too, that such skeptics as Frederic the Great, Horace Walpole, and Voltaire were on most friendly terms with him. He wrote amiably to Voltaire and told a cardinal who blamed him that he "did not find it clear that Voltaire was a stranger to the faith." His chief friend, Cardinal Passionei, was a cleric of loose and luxurious life.

I should say today that I overrated the intellectual power of Benedict in my book, though I pointed out that he was no genius. He did much to improve the literature of his Church, but he did not at all appreciate the advance of his time. We have a curious proof in his pronouncements on usury. No more curious moral blunder was committed by the medieval Church, Popes and theologians alike, than to say that usury, by which they meant the taking of any interest on money, was a sin. One would have thought that by the middle of the eighteenth century an able and liberal Pope would be the last man to recall this opinion, yet, when the question was raised in 1745, Benedict committed it to a group of cardinals and monks, and in a special encyclical he solemnly endorsed their finding, that it was unlawful to take any interest at all on loans. Books were put on the Roman Index after this date for defending the taking of interest. When one recalls how advanced the economic life of Europe had become by 1745, one cannot think highly of the intelligence of a Pope who would flagrantly defy one of the most innocent of its principles. Even in the nineteenth century, by the way, Catholic writers quite solemnly debated the subject in France. It was not until 1873 that the Vatican ruled, in answer to numerous appeals, that Catholics might accept interest up to five per cent, provisionally, until the Congregation gave a formal decision; and it has never yet ventured to give the decision. Some people call that moral wisdom and profound statesmanship.

Benedict's edition of the Index (1758) does not at all justify the claim that he opened a new era of Rome's censorship, and the title that I have given to this chapter must be taken as in part ironical. It is true that a large number of the absurd errors which had disfigured the Roman Index for two hundred years, though Protestants had repeatedly pointed

them out and ridiculed them, were removed. It is not a remarkable advance when we reflect that Benedict had what were considered to be the best scholars in Rome at work on the new list for five years, and, as Reusch shows, they still left in it dozens of crude errors that any scholar ought to be able to correct. It is a singular excuse to say that the books were no longer available, since, obviously, it was in that case stupid to leave them on the Index. Dr. Putnam's claim for Benedict, that he opened a new era by paying less attention to foreign Protestants and by concentrating on Catholic writers, is even less fortunate. For a hundred years, since the beginning of Jansenism, the Congregation of the Index had been mainly concerned with Catholic controversy. In short, the Index was still a clumsy and tyrannical implement for the protection of falsehood, and it in every page reflected the low state of culture which was bound to issue from such protection. Just at that time Cardinal Querini, more ashamed than the Pope of their work, offered to reorganize and endow out of his own fortune the work of the Congregation. Benedict refused the offer. The owlish Dominicans and unprincipled Jesuits must not be disturbed. Their work was effective. The Pope himself was too ignorant to see that there was growing in the world a new spirit which would in another century force the Papacy itself not merely to mend its ways but to lie about them.

CHAPTER X

THE CENSORSHIP IN FRANCE AND SPAIN

SINCE, as we saw, the guidance of Rome was emphatically rejected by four-fifths of the Catholic world, except on the few occasions when monarchs or prelates needed the aid of the Pope's anathemas in dealing with their critics, I need not go into further detail about the Roman Indexes. It is one of the curious features of Catholic history that there has been in the last hundred years more submissiveness to the Pope than at any time since the re-awakening of Europe. Catholics are very poorly informed about the history of their own religion since the Reformation. At times they may read references to the Gallican Church, or they may be told to ignore the Spanish Inquisition on the ground that it was a national institution independent of the Popes, but a collection of the defiant messages that were sent to the Popes, in spite of all their threats, from France, Spain, Portugal, Naples, Venice, and south Germany, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries would fill them with astonishment. The rise of large Catholic bodies, by immigration and annexation, in Protestant countries, where there is no tradition of independence, and the devastation of the Church in the Latin countries by skepticism and Socialism, have made all branches of the Church more docile to Rome. We are not here concerned with that change, but we must see how the Catholic hierarchy exercised its censorship in lands which declined to receive the Roman Index. As my readers will not be anxious to know every detail, significant or insignificant, about the censorship, it will be enough to describe the work in France and Spain.

I have in an earlier chapter described how the French bishops, like those of every other Catholic land, reacted to the spread of Protestantism by controlling the presses and the bookstores just as rigorously as the Popes did. In its first hour of freedom, when the king's sister was attracted to Calvin and the Reformers, when men complained that these evangelical preachers drew greater crowds at Paris than the orthodox churches, the revolt spread so rapidly that the hierarchy was deeply alarmed. An almost incredible statement of a visitor to Paris about the year 1540, reproduced in Putnam's "Censorship" (II, 336), gives us some idea why the French, who were no puritans, so readily accepted anti-Roman teaching. He tells us that he heard a preacher speak thus in a sermon:

A new language has been discovered which they call Greek. Against this you must be carefully on your guard, for it is the infant tongue of all heresies. There is a book written in that language called the New Testament. It is a book full of thorns and vipers. As to the Hebrew tongue, it is well known that all who learn it become Jews.

One can well imagine that people who discovered how such dupery had been practiced on them were disposed to listen to the new teaching. That such ideas were not confined to rustic congregations is clear from the violent opposition of the theological faculty of the University of Paris to the founding of a college for the teaching of Greek and Hebrew. It submitted to the king and Parlement that "to propagate a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew languages would lead to the destruction of religion."

However, political adversity and the ravages of syphilis (of which he died eventually) drove King Francis I into the arms of the clergy and the Pope. It was only thirty years since his father had struck a medal with the inscription "I will destroy the very name of Babylon [Rome]," but the son was beaten, and with *his* son in turn there entered into France the influence of the fanatical and disreputable Catherine de Medici and the Jesuits, and a few decades of repression culminated in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Yet France was still so independent of the Vatican that in 1580 the Pope's bull against heretics, which he wished to enforce on the country, was officially and derisively burned at Paris. Twice in the next ten years were Papal bulls burned by the king. Cardinal Richelieu, as I have shown elsewhere, actually brooded over a plan of making the French Church independent of all Papal authority. Meantime, however, the Puritans and the Jesuits had entered into the fiery controversy which was to keep both the French and Roman censorship busy for a hundred years.

It is known as the Jansenist controversy, since it began with the condemnation by Rome of a work of Jansen, Bishop of Ypres. Technically it was a quarrel of rival schools of theology about the insoluble problem of grace and free will which theology had created for itself, but it is more material here to regard it as a protest of the theologians of Louvain University, which was taken up by the puritans of Paris, against the lax moral teaching of the Jesuits. Jansen had attacked them, and they induced the Papacy to condemn him. The struggle now passed to Paris. One effect of the cult of the New Testament that the Reformation had

inspired was, naturally, to create a fairly large body of puritans at Paris, and they regarded the Jesuits as in very large part responsible for the prevailing sexual freedom. All the nobles who make French history so picturesque at this period were trained in Jesuit colleges, and as a rule their mistresses had Jesuit confessors. The details of the quarrel need not be given here. It put more than a hundred Jansenist books and pamphlets on the Index, and when the controversy still raged, the Pope, at the suggestion of the Jesuits, extracted five passages from Jansen's book as untenable, and the acceptance of the condemnation of these was made a test of loyalty. The puritans replied that the passages were not in Jansen's book, and the fight went on to the end of the century.

There was from beginning to end nothing more than, at the most, a microscopic divergence here and there from the narrow line of doctrinal formularies, and it is the broader aspect of the struggle that interests us. Louis XIV was, as I said, eager in his later years to make some atonement in time for the amorous freedom of his manhood, and the Jesuits easily convinced him that the crushing of heretics was the most effective, as well as least exacting, form of penance. From the first he had shown a merciless zeal against the French Protestants. In 1685 he had instructed the archbishop of Paris to draw up a list of heretical works, and under very heavy penalties he forbade the sale of these and the publication of any further Protestant criticisms. The language of the documents is repulsive. Louis, it is true, was already under the chaster influence of Mme. de Maintenon, but Archbishop Harlay (see my *History of the Church of Rome*) and most of the prelates were more than epicurean. The Protestants were scattered by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and Louis turned on the Jansenists. Their ablest leader now was Quesnel, and I have described how the Pope was induced, against the view of his cardinals, to oblige Louis by condemning a book of Quesnel of which the cardinal archbishop of Paris—not Harlay, but the more respectable Cardinal Noailles—and many bishops fully approved. The Pope's bull was accepted by the Sorbonne by a bare majority of the theologians, and the archbishop openly criticized it. Louis was hounded on by the Jesuits. They had, says the Duchess of Orleans, "instilled into him such a fear of hell that he believed all who had not been educated by the Jesuits were damned." He demanded the deposition of the archbishop, but he died before further steps could be taken.

The struggle continued for a further half century and put another hundred documents on the Index. It was more ironical than ever. During the eight years of Regency which followed the death of Louis XIV the freedom of life at Paris was greater than it had ever been before. "The Church could not sink lower," says the French historian Martin, when he tells how the debauched minister Dubois, of the debauched Regent was made a cardinal and head of the French Church. He, it is true, "turned from libertinage to ambition," coquetted with Rome and crushed its critics, but "excess of work completed what excess of vice had begun." Under his religious successors the Jansenists were still persecuted, yet they remained very numerous. They discovered amongst their clergy various saints at whose tombs miracles were worked, and, when the authorities forbade them to hold services, they crowded into private houses and ran

to every excess of neurotic frenzy. Ecstasies, convulsions (in which some died), mutual scourging, and even driving nails through their hands and feet at length brought discredit upon the body.

Such was the movement that chiefly occupied the theological censors of Paris and Rome for more than a hundred years; while the world at large was preparing to annihilate the Jesuits and was moving from Deism to a deeper skepticism, and France was advancing rapidly toward bankruptcy. Yet the Jesuit Hilgers, the chief modern Catholic writer on the Index, eloquently explains to his readers that these Jansenists, whom the Jesuits fought with such magnificent foresight, were the cause of all the skepticism, revolution, and "unrestricted passion" that followed! Dr. Putnam reproduces his argument without quite endorsing it. He would have done better to point out that Louis XIV spent 214,000,000 francs (equal to nearly \$200,000,000 in modern money) on his luxurious buildings while tens of thousands perished of starvation in the country and hundreds of thousands fought the rates for scraps of food and even chewed their clothing or bit into their own muscles. To the appalling injustice of the kings and aristocracy the Jesuits were as callously indifferent as to their mistresses. They deservedly brought ruin upon themselves and the French Church, and the only merit we can award them, from the modern viewpoint, is that their blind concentration on the censoring of more religious writers than themselves did enable the fine work of Montaigne and Montesquieu to get into circulation. There were, of course, drastic rules against such writers, but they found printers in Holland or the provinces, and secretly skeptical statesmen and even mistresses of the king softened the rigor of the laws.

In view of the fact that Dr. Putnam's work has been accepted as a quite impartial and thorough history of the censorship, it may be useful to correct his observations on French literature at this period. He quotes from the French literary historian Dejob, a Catholic, the statement that he finds "no book of importance except the *Tartuffe* of Molière which the national authorities attempted to suppress," and that the superiority of French literature in the seventeenth century was due to the lighter censorship. Dejob is not quite accurate. Montaigne was expurgated, the chief works of Pascal, Descartes, and Malebranche were suppressed, and so on. Yet a remarkable amount of skeptical and semi-skeptical literature got into circulation, while few of those whom Dr. Putnam gives as the great clerical scholars were quite free from the censor. It is rather incongruous for a skeptical writer to tell us that any nation might be proud to have in one century five such scholars, as Bossuet, Fénelon, Bourdaloue, Malebranche, and Mabillon. The first three were preachers, not great scholars: the fourth was a philosopher who is barely mentioned in a modern history of philosophy: the fifth alone might be called a distinguished scholar. The fact is that through the scandalous and almost unprecedented exploitation of the people in the seventeenth century by royalty, nobles, and Church there was an accumulation of wealth which, as usual, led to a great literary and artistic movement. The Church shared in this and produced an exceptional number of orators and scholars in the ecclesiastical sense, but the general body of literature was very secular,

and the wide spread of Deism amongst the educated class and statesmen enabled some of the most advanced writers to defeat the censorship.

When we turn from France to Spain we find a very significant contrast. The brilliance of French literature is fully sustained in the eighteenth century, and it becomes increasingly secular and skeptical. Clerical scholarship decays, but humanist culture rises to the height of Montesquieu, Buffon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and D'Alembert. In Spain, on the contrary, culture and literature perish, not even clerical scholarship producing a writer whom anybody reads today. And Dr. Putnam acknowledges that the literary wealth of France was due to the relaxation of censorship and the poverty of Spain to its severity. Spanish works of the sixteenth and seventeenth century "bear everywhere the marks of subjection," he says, and he cancels many of his own compliments to the Church when he adds (II, 326):

From the abject title pages and dedications of the authors themselves through the series of certificates collected from their friends to establish the orthodoxy of works that were often as little connected with religion as fairy tales down to the colophon supplicating pardon for any unconscious neglect of the authority of the Church or for any too free use of classical mythology, we are continually impressed with painful proofs, not only how completely the human mind was enslaved in Spain, but how grievously it had become cramped and crippled by what it had so long borne.

This is in strange contrast to his statement in his introduction that the question how far the censorship in Spain interfered with literature "cannot be satisfactorily answered." He now approvingly quotes Ticknor's assurance that there was a "sinful tyranny" over all intellects, that a "degradation of the national character was sure to follow," and that all this was not even compensated by a zeal to reform morals.

There is even less ground for the common excuse that the people detested heresy and were quite content to be protected from it. From the date of the ultimate triumph over the Moors the clergy hunted fanatically for the books to which the educated class clung. Torquemada in 1490 burned six thousand volumes, Arabic and Hebrew, in one city alone. Cardinal Ximenes had five thousand exquisitely written and bound Arabic manuscripts burned in the public square at Granada. But these beautiful memorials of the dead civilization had scarcely been destroyed when the presses of Germany and the Netherlands (then part of the Spanish empire) began to send Spanish translations of the new literature. Some of the works of Erasmus had an immense circulation in Spain, and, though many even of the bishops long declined to see heresy in the entertaining pages of Erasmus, his popularity clearly shows that the Spaniards at that time were quite willing to read criticisms. The authorities, in fact, had very considerable trouble in keeping the new Protestant literature from them. "The Spanish people," says Dejob, "strove earnestly for the maintenance of the faith." So the untruth passes from writer to writer. Nine-tenths of the Spanish people were now illiterate and unaware of the existence of heretical works, while the literate laymen "strove earnestly" to get those works. The most stringent regulations were passed by the

clergy and Inquisition—whether they used the state to publish and enforce them makes no difference—as early as 1521. In 1524 two casks of Lutheran books were found hidden in a Dutch vessel to Spain and burned, and large quantities of such works were found in the same year in three Venetian vessels. The Inquisition from that time onward had an army of agents to prevent the importation and reading of heretical works, and they effectively prevented the printing of any in Spain, yet as late as 1570 thirty thousand copies of a Spanish translation of Calvin's *Institutes* got into the country. As everywhere else, the Church, whether using the civic authorities or not, fought the demand of the people for freedom to read.

Tichnor says that bookselling was practically extinct in Spain by the year 1600. The Spanish censorship was in the hands of the Inquisition and the most meticulous regulations were supported by the most formidable penalties. Every leaf of a manuscript had to be signed by an official; every correction had to be initialed as scrupulously as if the document were a check. Any man who showed a page of unauthorized written matter on religion to a friend was liable to be put to death, in one of the many picturesque Spanish ways, and have all his property confiscated. Thus all his family was punished, and the agents, who shared the fines and confiscations, were encouraged. Confessors joined in the good work by interrogating all penitents about books. All this had gone on for more than half a century. In 1559 a French priest had brought into Spain a French translation of the psalms which had no printer's name on it, and he innocently asked a Spanish bookseller if he could tell him where it had been printed. It was on the bookseller's list of forbidden books and he denounced the priest to the Inquisition. He got five months in prison and was tortured, on the plea that he refused to tell who had sold him the book. When foreign vessels with heretics on board touched Spanish ports, agents of the Inquisition went aboard and put conspicuous labels on their books, after searching their baggage, so that they could be detected at once if they were taken ashore. The traveler had to prove that his books were innocent, and even writings of English Catholic martyrs like Fisher and More were blacklisted.

The real aim, in fact, of the Spanish Church was to prevent laymen from reading any book that bore on religion. I told in an earlier chapter of the first Spanish Index. This was enlarged in 1583 by the new Inquisitor General, Quiroga, who, as I said, even included writings of Thomas More and Bishop Fisher. Large numbers of innocent Spanish writers of devotional works, even St. Francis Borgia, the pride of the Spanish Jesuits, were listed. Quiroga's list was so monstrous that a Neapolitan friar who drew up a private Index for the use of confessors put Quiroga's Index on it. Yet in 1612 the new Inquisitor General, Sandoval, enlarged it to 744 pages and made absurd additions to it. *Don Quixote* was now put on the list "until it be corrected," because Cervantes had said somewhere in it that "works of charity that are performed carelessly are useless." The Neapolitan monk critic was blacklisted, and hundreds of obscure English and German writers were added; and I may add that Catholics are still ludicrously warned against many of them in the very latest and most scientific edition of the Roman Index.

The Portuguese Church copied this portentous list, and in both countries permits to read could be obtained only of the Inquisitor General, who would promptly suspect of heresy any man who wanted to read such damnable works. The city of Seville distinguished itself by having an Index of a thousand pages.

Yet we learn from the words of the Inquisitor General Sotomayor, who published a still larger Index in 1640, that Spaniards were still trying to get heretical literature. The gangs of agents were strengthened and the rules made more severe. It was now forbidden to make any complimentary reference to a heretic which implied that he had a good character or judgment. One was permitted to call Buchanan an "elegant poet" and Tycho Brahe a "distinguished astronomer," but no manuscript was passed in which non-Catholic writers were described as excellent or most learned or wise men. Even the word "good" was struck out of historical works. The Spanish mind was being hammered into that modern shape which one must describe as rather worse than mediæval. Sensible men still protested, and one of the clerical pundits explained that, while he was "prepared to recognize the possibility of heretics possessing learning or talents," he finds it "entirely improper to give any measure of praise to such men who have failed to use for the support of the true faith the abilities with which they have been endowed by the Lord." Yet just in this period the Spanish court was "the gayest and wickedest since the days of Elagabalus," says Hume, and the exploitation of the country was criminal.

There was much the same use of the Index by rival monastic theologians as in France and Italy. The Dominicans, one of whom was always Inquisitor General, put a large number of Jesuit writers on the Index, and at a later date the Jesuits secured a condemnation of their Benedictine rivals for their famous Bollandist Lives of the Saints. We may ignore these things and the occasional use of the Index for political purposes, to oblige the king. By 1747 the Spanish Index had grown to two volumes, with twelve hundred pages, and was the largest ever issued. One would think that by this time there could not possibly be the least taint of heresy in the country, yet a thousand people were burned alive and twelve thousand were punished in various ways by the Inquisition in the first half of the eighteenth century. Theological scholarship fell with all the culture of the land. I have described elsewhere how the Voltairean Count D'Aranda made a noble effort to restore civilization in the second half of the eighteenth century and did succeed in expelling the Jesuits, but the clergy defeated him, and Spain sank once more. The new Index of 1790, in spite of the awakening of Europe and the guidance of the reformed Index of Benedict XIV, was even worse than the Roman Indexes had been before Benedict. The owlish monks put on it numbers of foreign works which they had obviously never seen. One line runs: "Fulko Greville, Theliffe Of the Renovudne, Senior Phillip Ciduæy." They meant Fulk Greville's "Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney." Reusch gives a long list of such monstrosities: Isubmarus for the Hubmaier, Schurpleixt for Schurzfleisch, Cocingus for Conring, Brucz for Budæus, Clinspachius for Flinsbach, Dolbrunerus for Heilbron, and so on. Nearly all the blunders of the early Indexes were included though Benedict XIV

had corrected most of them thirty years earlier, and the Spaniards certainly had his Index. Their general rules show that they in part copied it. There were at the time plenty of English priests or students of theology in Spain, yet the compilers of the Index treated English as if it were Sanscrit. Hearing vaguely of a work "by Jeremy Taylor," they put on their Index "Taylor—By, Jer." By this time, however, the echoes of the French Revolution were rumbling over Europe and we will take the period of advance and reaction for the whole Church in the next chapter.

CHAPTER XI

THE REVOLUTION AND THE REACTION

POPE BENEDICT XIV died in the year in which he published his Index, 1758, and the cardinals and prelates of Rome who had bitterly resented his liberality and frivolity were soon confirmed in their adherence to the older policy. In the following year France exhibited to them two symptoms of a new malady that began to infect the mind of Europe: one a thoroughly materialistic and pestilential work that had been received with applause at Paris, Helvétius's "On the Mind," and the other the first work to reach Rome of a brilliant and mordant young writer who called himself Voltaire. Two years later a French translation of David Hume's "Treatise on Human Nature" had to be registered on the black list, and it was followed by Rousseau's "Emile." About the same time a ban was put on all the works of Frederic the Great, the successive volumes of the Encyclopaedia appeared in spite of royal prohibition, and Voltaire went from one caustic work to another. In 1757 Louis XV had been induced to decree that in future any man who wrote or distributed books against religion should incur the death penalty, yet it was in the ten years after this formidable prohibition that a brilliant and learned body of anti-Christian writers—Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvétius, Diderot, D'Alembert, Holbach, LaMettrie, etc.—launched their works in France and carried the skeptical revolt from deism into atheism and materialism. And just in this period the Church and the Catholic governments were distracted by the campaign which drove the Jesuits out of one country after another and eventually compelled the Pope to endorse the heavy charges against them and condemn them.

Yet Rome still failed to perceive that the world was entering upon a new era. There has been no historical period in which the Vatican has shown an intelligent grasp of the thought-tendencies of the age. We shall see presently that all the supposed modernizing of its work in recent times is insincere, and that it still merely wonders how long it will be before it can bring the world back to the ideas of Hildebrand and Thomas Aquinas. You may impatiently exclaim that there must be considerable ability in Rome, since it is, after all, the metropolis of a community of some two hundred million people. But until recent times the internationalism of the Church of Rome was very faintly reflected in the life of Rome itself. Every Pope, the majority of the cardinals, and the overwhelming majority of the officials, were Italians; and it says little for their collec-

tive talent that in three centuries they did not find one man for the supreme office who was capable of analyzing the thought of other countries as any moderately-endowed writer on religion would do. Dr. Putnam would choose Benedict XIV as the one such Pope between 1580 and 1880, but I have explained why we must take a very restricted view of the ability of a man, posing as the supreme moralist, who could condemn interest on capital in the economic world of the year 1750.

All that we perceive happening in Rome in the fateful period between 1760 and 1790 is that the Popes and the Congregation of the Index feel that there is, for some obscure reason, a temporary epidemic of anti-religious literature in France, and in 1778 Pius VI nervously issued a general ban against "all works of unbelievers." Of the quite logical development that had proceeded in the mind of England, France and Germany, as the political and philosophical principles of Hobbes, Locke, and Montaigne were steadily elaborated, the owls of the Vatican were, quite unaware. There were much more disturbed by such trivialities as the reappearance, in Italy, of some subtle shade of the hurried heresy of Jansenism. The liberal Austrian Emperor Joseph II, who now controlled north Italy, had set up a theological faculty in the University of Pavia, and the professors adopted his liberal temper. Rome fell upon them with much more energy than upon the materialists of Paris. At the very height of the French Revolution, in 1794, the Papacy was absorbed in a spirited campaign against an ecclesiastical synod, held at Pistoja, which had the temerity to call again for that reform of the Church which the Vatican neglected. The Pope was in much the same situation as King Louis in France. He was far more concerned about little domestic disturbances than about the rapid advance of thought which threatened his kingdom.

Even the immense literature which the French Revolution evoked in every country was hardly noticed by the Congregation of the Index, though the Spanish censors vainly listed a good deal of it. One might plead in extenuation of Rome's apparent obtuseness at this period that it could hardly be expected to look beyond its own frontiers and study the great liberal movement in England and Germany. But the French Revolution was essentially a Latin movement, and from France its literature made surprising progress in Spain and north Italy. The plain truth is that the Papacy was bewildered. It never profoundly studied the growth of thought which preceded a revolt, and it was always taken by surprise. This outburst in France was, it thought, just a temporary insanity from which the country would soon recover, especially after the bleeding operation which it urged Austria to perform. Bayonets were still the appointed cure for group revolts. The Pope pompously condemned the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and he completely failed to see that this was a first installment of a world-revolt against the old social and political conditions; nor did he even, like most of the secular monarchs and moralists, begin to perceive that there was some profound injustice in those conditions. He devoted his attention to little domestic controversies in Italy and Austria until Napoleon opened a new phase of development in France. It is amusing, in view of the prodigious events that were happening in the world at that time, to read that the last work which the Congregation of the Index took the trouble to condemn in the eighteenth century was

a book by some person named Guadagnini, who was not quite respectful to Papal claims, and that the first book it condemned in the new century was a theological treatise by a scholar of the Greek Church. Napoleon's generals regarded the whole Papal system with disdain, when they conveyed Pius VII to France to hear the orders of his master, and wondered if he would ever have a successor.

Catholic writers make much of the fact that the revolutionaries and Napoleon set up a more rigorous censorship than the Church had exercised. As usual, they make their point by choosing a particular stage of the Revolution and applying this to the whole. The men who carried the French Revolution, directed the country for three years and gave it its first Constitution, abolished both the political and the religious censorship. In the first decree that embodied the rights of man it was said:

Full exchange of thought and opinion is one of the rights most precious to mankind. Every citizen is to be free to speak, write, and print as he will, with the sole restriction that if the liberty be abused he will be liable for any injury caused by such abuse.

That is an elementary social principle; and it was derided by the Pope. But it is false to say that "the revolutionaries" later changed their minds and resorted to tyranny. None of the early leaders had any share in the change of the law. Even when the Jacobins came to power, they, after a spell of persecution, reaffirmed the freedom of literature to the press. That was the law as late as 1795, the sixth year of the Revolution. It was only after the terrible experiences of that time, which were in large part due to the panic caused by formidable invasions and civil war, that a drastic censorship of political literature was established. Naturally Napoleon used this to protect his own power. But these references to secular censorships which modern Catholic writers multiply throw dust in the eyes of the reader. It would be ingenuous to plead on behalf of a murderer that he is not the only one, and if Catholic writers bring before us instances in which monarchs or corporations killed men to protect their own power, we will gladly extend to them the language we use about the Papacy. But there are two further differences. One is that civil governments did not hypocritically plead the eternal salvation of men when they suppressed criticism of themselves. The second is that in few instances, and then only for a short time (after the seventeenth century at least), did they inflict penalties for the expression of opinion comparable with those at the command of the Catholic censors of every country.

It is more interesting to observe the working of the Roman censorship during the reaction after Waterloo. The Papacy heartily agreed with the various monarchs of Europe that what had happened since 1789 was a nightmare and it might and must be totally dissipated. Indeed the Papacy ranged itself with the least enlightened and most rancorous of the European monarchs. When the other chief powers saw that the returned royalists at Paris were determined to make no concession whatever to the new vision of rights of the people, they warned the king that he

must not be intransigent. When the French king saw that Ferdinand of Spain went much farther in brutality than himself, he sent Ferdinand a warning, and the British representatives at Madrid warned him still more effectively. But the Pope rebuked no act of brutality, for in his own kingdom he used against his rebels a savagery that was second only to the horrors that were perpetrated in Spain and Portugal. One might say that the kings of Spain, Portugal and Naples and the Pope were the master-criminals of Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century. The censorship was therefore used more vigorously than ever to prevent modern literature from reaching Roman Catholics. As it is generally admitted that the Popes of the nineteenth century before Leo XIII were blundering mediocrities, we will not linger over this period, but a little may be said about the literature of the different Catholic countries that was suppressed.

Most of the Italian writers who were listed in the next half century are so little known outside Italy that a list of names would be tedious. Deism had spread through French literature in the last part of the nineteenth century, and the invasion of Napoleon greatly promoted the growth of skepticism and opposition to Rome. The universities of the cities of north Italy began to recover their vitality, and we find a considerable number of professors of philosophy and history on the Index. A translation of Kant and several works on Kant were listed, and several works which adopted the philosophy of Hegel were condemned. Many commentaries on Dante, histories of Italian literature and general histories of Italy were prohibited. Biographies of Paola Sarfi and of Arnold of Brescia, accounts of the Saracen civilization in Sicily, works on law that did not recognize the full claims of the Papacy, and religious or philosophical works by devout Catholics (Rosmini, etc.) who rejected the scholastic method in order to meet modern thought fell under the ban. As the work of emancipation had to proceed secretly, we naturally find drastic and repeated condemnations of secret societies, such as Freemasonry and Carbonarism, and, with the customary obliquity of the Roman censors, Spiritual literature is put on a level with these. As the struggle developed, works challenging the temporal power of the Pope came on the list, but it does not surprise us that when the revolution of 1848 broke upon Rome, the Pope was naively surprised, as he had been busy for some years with the fine shades of heresy of Rosmini and the Immaculate Conception of Mary and other transcendental matters.

As, however, the Popes still relied in this period on the Inquisition and the truculent zeal of their police, and the writers they condemned are unknown today, let us pass to France. It was at last perceived that the French Revolution had its roots in the anti-Christian writers who had preceded it. Naturally the French and Roman censors did not notice the very obvious conclusion that these were the only moralists in France to preach real justice in the eighteenth century. They just took them as a group of poisonous writers whose atheism was destructive of moral principle and added Condillac, Condorcet, Volney, and others to the long list I have already given. Promptly also the censors forbade an anti-Christian work, now forgotten but of historical interest, that had been published

in the days of Napoleon and was probably greatly enjoyed by him: Pigault's "*Le Citateur*." The interest is that one of the ways in which Napoleon had annoyed the Pope, when he was reluctant to yield, was to order that ten thousand copies of this book should be given away to the public. The very much more serious work of the learned Benjamin Constant, "*Religion Considered in Its Sources*," was listed a few years later. But works on religion were now so frequently condemned that I need notice only the most important. Victor Cousin's "*Course of the History of Philosophy*" was condemned, though he wrote personally to the Pope to say that he was "a devout upholder of the Christian faith." Comte's "*Course of Positive Philosophy*" was listed, but no other works of his. Taine's "*History of English Literature*" also was condemned; and, of course, most of the works of the historian Michelet and of Renan.

In short, hardly any scholarly French work that even the expert reads today was not condemned by the Church, and, as I showed in the introduction, most of the finest literary works were put on the Index. It would, in fact, be more interesting to inquire which French works of importance were not blacklisted, and why, but before the middle of the century the censorship merely provoked the smiles of the majority of Frenchmen, and the country drifted steadily away from Catholicism. The Roman and French censors were just as ineffective in condemning the democratic school of the Abbe de la Mennais and the Socialist and Communist writers from Faurier and Cabet to the end of the century. After the Revolution of 1830 the whole machinery of censorship, having no longer a sincerely Catholic monarch to rely upon, became ineffective in France. The Index, which never reaches the general public, is of use only when printers and booksellers can be controlled. For their own dwindling flock the clergy had to rely on the general prohibition of books against faith or morals, and the extraordinary decay of religion from 1830 to 1870 shows that little attention was paid to this. The censors might continue to show that they were still alive by condemning the greater poets and novelists but it had no effect on their circulation.

In Spain the action of the Inquisition, which controlled literature, varied with the political history of the country. At every revolution the people at once clamored for the abolition of the Inquisition, attacked its buildings, and released its prisoners. It is not generally realized that every member of the Spanish Bourbon dynasty since Napoleon, except the father of the late king (whose dissipations saved him by bringing on a premature death) was ignominiously expelled from the country. After the second revolution, in 1822, the monarchs dare not restore the Inquisition, in spite of the angry pressure of the Church and the Jesuits and the support they gave to Don Carlos' party because that miserable adventurer promised to restore it. From the Revolution of 1868 until the usurpation of General de Ribera the censorship as such was ineffective, though skeptics were often punished on other pretexts, and all the rationalist works of European literature were translated into Spanish and sold freely. Putnam gives only a few unimportant Spanish works condemned, and he makes a curious mistake when he adds that "the long series of anti-clerical romances by Benito, Perez, and Galdòs escaped


condemnation." Benito Perez Galdòs is, of course, the famous novelist who died in 1920. Dorente's *History of the Inquisition* is, naturally, on the Index.

The collection of modern English works which fall under the Roman censorship is curious. It shows the complete casualness and literary ignorance of the censors. Paine's "Age of Reason," the most deadly of controversial works after Voltaire, seems never to have been heard of at Rome, while Swift's "Tale of a Tub," Richardson's "Pamela" (which can scarcely be thought of special interest to Rome), Defoe's "Robinson Crusoe," and even Burke's highly respectable "Reflections on the French Revolution" were condemned. Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," J. S. Mill's "Political Economy," and even Wheatley's "Elements of Logic" were found poisonous to Catholics, while the hundreds of acrid Protestant attacks on Romanism were unnoticed. Of all the large and generally anti-Roman works of the nineteenth century the Index put its ban only on such uninfluential works as Oliver Goldsmith's "History of England." Erasmus Darwin was, as I said, condemned, while Charles Darwin and all his great contemporaries were ignored, though their chief works circulated all over Europe. The whole English list shows that until late in the century there cannot have been any consultation of even a moderately informed Englishman. It would be difficult to say why Frederic Denison Maurice should be selected, but the censors openly betray that they know nothing about him since they list him under the name of Denison. For the rest I need say only that the other English authors condemned between 1820 and 1880, a period of intense religious controversy, are Stroud, Lady Morgan, Waldie, James Blunt, Hobart Seymour, John Poynde, and Peter Gandolphy—not Huxley, Carlyle, Spencer, Froude, Creighton, Buckle, Green, Tyndall, Morley, and Swinburne. And some people call the Index a catalogue of great literature.

America is even more scurvily treated. The only three American works given by Putnam are a pamphlet (1822) by a rebel priest who had a row with his bishop: a Spanish translation, forty years later, of a small Neo-Malthusian work by F. Hollick; and Draper's well known work, which was condemned in 1876. South America, naturally, has made a larger contribution. The cynic would be disposed to say that in modern times literatures are represented on the Index in proportion to their unimportance, but the fact is that the American prelates do not want Rome to advertise the futile tyranny of its institutions in America. They are content with the general rule of the Index and the Church, that he who reads books against religion or morals incurs eternal damnation. To Germany, in fine, we need not give special consideration. Apart from Heine, a few of the early biblical critics, and the "Old Catholics" who, like Döllinger, rejected the infallibility of the Pope, the list has no interest for us. The anti-religious works which have profoundly influenced Germany, Catholic and Protestant, in recent times—the works of Haeckel, Büchner, Moleschott, Feuerbach, Bölsche, Nietzsche, etc.—have never been listed. By the second part of the nineteenth century the Index was regarded everywhere as a piece of humorous literature.

CHAPTER XII

ROME PRETENDS TO MODERNIZE

HE second half of the nineteenth century was in regard to religion the most critical period in the history of the race. No particular century in the chronicle of the ancient world can in this respect compare with it in importance, and the sixteenth century was fateful only for one creed and in one half of its range of distribution. In the second half of the nineteenth century, when science, history, sociology, and biblical criticism fully revealed their antagonism to received opinions, and the general education of the race and cheapening of literature made the result known to all, the crisis affected every shade of religion. During this period the Church of Rome, which professes to meet every crisis with a serenity and wisdom that are peculiar to itself, was governed and directed by two men, Pius IX (1846-78) and Leo XIII (1878-1903). In the ages of universal faith and sordid passion a dozen or more Popes would succeed each other in the Chain of Peter in half a century. Evidently Rome had now adopted something of the respectability of an age of skepticism, and each of the two Popes remained in office long enough to make a profound study of his age and adapt the Papal policy to its needs.

Pius IX was the worst blunderer, when we consider the task that confronted him, since Sixtus V. He met the new age, even after it had given him a rude lesson in the Revolution of 1848, by drawing up a list (a *Syllabus*) of its aims and beliefs, and assuring all Catholics that these "liberals" of every shade were the spawn of the devil. Catholics make us laugh when they assure us, with nervous solemnity, that they do not claim that Pius IX was infallible in his *Syllabus*. What interests us is the degree of stupidity it exhibits. And yet this Pope brought together all the bishops of the Catholic world and thought that the second half of the nineteenth century was a good time to induce them, by bribery and bullying, to declare that the Popes are infallible. But, the Catholic exclaims, Leo XIII restored the prestige of the Papacy. Does not all the world still speak with respect of the learning, the wisdom, the diplomacy, and the profound knowledge of his age of Leo XIII?

I have shown in my "Crises in the History of the Papacy" that Leo XIII blundered on every side, failed in nearly all his aims, and was, in his later years, hopelessly baffled by the problems he had to face. Here we have to see how he met the particular problem of giving some sort of intellectual respectability to the disreputable old system of censorship. In the later days of Pius IX there were loud demands for a change. The world at large spoke of it as an eccentricity of feebleness, something like the pigtail of the decaying Manchus in China. Catholics in most parts of the world warmly repudiated the Roman Index and eagerly pointed out that it had never been received in their countries. But even in Italy it was by 1870, when the Piedmontese troops had liberated most of the country, as little regarded as is the Volstead Act.

One of the tasks of the Vatican Council, Catholic writers and bishops said, was to show the world that in the matter of censorship as in other matters the Church had really moved a little since the Council of Trent three hundred years earlier. Friedrich shows in his History of the Vatican Council that French and German bishops and Catholic writers in all countries were demanding a reform of the Index; and we shall find Leo XIII confirming this. Pius IX had given some occasion for the agitation, as in 1868 he had appointed one of the heavy Roman commissions of cardinals and theologians to consider the subject. It held only one or two meetings and dropped the subject, but the agitation in the Church went on. An important German Catholic review said editorially in 1869:

We accept the view, which is now being presented very generally throughout the Church, that the reconstitution of the organization and methods of Roman censorship is essential in order to meet the very great changes in the conditions of literary production which have come about since the time of Benedict XIV.

Some held that the Index and its Congregation ought to be adandoned and the work of censorship, or condemnation of new books, left to the bishops in each country, but most Catholics outside Italy, and many in Italy, demanded reform. This musty and stupid list of books brought discredit on the Church. But at the Vatican Council, which was described to me by men who remembered it as full of intrigue and passionate quarrels, the Papal sandbag fell upon the reformers and nothing was done. Within a year the Pope had to put eleven Roman and Italian periodicals on the black list. Italy scoffed at the censorship, and now read the world's literature in freedom.

In 1878 Joachim Pecci became Pope Leo XIII, and those who knew how he had wormed his way through the diplomatic service expected a change of policy. But he knew his cardinals, and in his first address to them he announced that there would be no change, no compromise with modern civilization. And whatever other diplomatic concessions and readjustments may be claimed for Leo XIII, in the matter which here concerns us, the Index, he flatly defied his age and remained thoroughly medieval. He brought out a new edition of the Index in 1881, and the first page of it must have chilled reformers to the marrow. It began with the familiar old names, Abouzit, Abbadie, Abecedario, etc. I will in the next chapter give the entire first section of the Index, so that the reader can have no misgiving about the incredible stupidity of it, and will here borrow Dr. Putnam's analysis of the Leonine Index. He makes practically no comment on it. The sheer continuation of the old stupidity under a Pope whom he would like to admire seems to have amazed him, but he is much too polite a writer to say such things. The principle of the new history is to praise excessively everything Roman for which you find it possible to say a good word and pass quickly over whatever ugly facts you dare not entirely ignore.

We shall see that the most recent edition of the Index differs very little from that of Leo XIII, so this analysis fairly applies to both. But let me tell first how the Pope announces his aim and justifies his work. You get some idea when you notice on the cover that, unlike the recent

Index, which is in Italian, Leo's Index is published in Latin. Immutable Rome, you may say; but it is quite possible that the Pope was conscious that he could in Latin venture to perpetrate things which would look very crude in Italian. Leo's apparent defiance of his age was diplomatic, not like the blunt, robust, and ignorant defiance of his successors. His Index would satisfy the Italian mandarins of his court and would remain unknown to even the great bulk of the Catholic clergy. Putnam quotes from Hilgers part of an article that appeared in a Roman-English periodical in 1901, a few years after the appearance of the last edition of Leo's Index, which tells that "one of the great book collectors of New York"—in fact, Dr. Putnam—has managed to secure a copy of the Index. This is said to be quite a feat for an outsider. The copy is said to be worth forty to fifty dollars (five years after publication and while still on sale), and so few are in existence, and they are so difficult to get, that the value is expected to rise to four hundred dollars. This is an exaggeration. There is a copy of it on the open reference shelves of the British National Library (British Museum) where there are not supposed to be books of value. However, the facts show how cautious Rome was under Leo XIII to keep the Index within the family circle. I should imagine that the new Index, paper-covered and cheaply printed, could be bought for a dollar or two in Rome.

The introductory documents to the Index, some of which were meant to be translated and published throughout the Church, are different. First there is a Brief Letter of the Pope, written for him by a cardinal, which repeats the time-honored gags about the way in which Rome has surveyed the world's output of literature since printing began and drawn up "an accurate and absolute exposition or Index" of books that spread "the pest of evil heresies" or are "hurtful to piety or morals." There is then a long preface which attempts to prove that the Papacy has, in its own wisdom, not, of course, under any pressure from the Church, thought fit to make certain improvements. The chief of these is said to be that the Pope "revokes the rules of the holy Synod of Trent" and draws up certain new rules on Decretals which, he insists, shall henceforth bind Catholics in every country. We will return to these in a moment. The author of the preface then explains why certain heretical books are listed individually while these are obviously only a small part of the whole heretical literature. It is quite simple. These are books which have been brought to the notice of the congregation by a bishop or other person. But why this crude system and its products are retained in the "modernized" Church the writer does not venture to explain; and, in any case, the admission makes an end of the myth that there are in the Vatican some lynx-eyed observers of the literature of every country reporting to the Pope whenever a wicked book appears.

The preface goes on to explain that Leo XIII had decided to "temper the severity of the old rules" and to "accommodate the whole spirit of the Index to the times." We shall find, we are told, that books prohibited before the year 1600 are struck off the Index. It does not seem very bold to omit the names of all the forgotten theologians of the sixteenth and earlier centuries, especially when we are reminded that they are "still forbidden." Very few of them, in any case, are available. A second

"mitigation" is said to be that, whereas the old Index forbade all the works of many authors the Catholic is now permitted to read such books of theirs as do not deal with religion. The third adaptation to the age is that certain works of distinction which had only a "slight taint" are omitted from the Index because of their value. Omitted also are ancient books by Catholics "which deal with the Immaculate Conception"—in plain English, violently defended it before the Church discovered that it was a dogma—and large numbers of the works of rival theologians and monastic bodies which only perpetuated the memory of domestic squabbles: works dealing with magic, superstitious practices, bogus indulgences, etc., which are no longer practical (and discredit the Church): pamphlets and small works "full of venom and danger," though "for the most part scholastic," which are now forgotten. These are the chief concessions to "the spirit of the age," and the preface closes with an assurance that the new Index is the last word in Catholic scholarship.

The "Constitution of Pope Leo XIII" which follows is for the most part an historical sketch of the censorship, and it sustains the prestige of the Papacy by such erroneous statements as that Paul IV (who got the idea from Louvain University and Spain) was the first to suggest the compilation of an Index, and that the single aim of the Popes was "to protect *human society* from errors of opinions and from influences inimical to morality." With sublime effrontery the Pope then says that the older censorship had "good results" as long as "the temporal rulers of states" were willing to cooperate, but the new conditions of society dispose the Church in its wisdom to modify the rules and alter the list. In this Constitution the Pope frankly admits that before the Vatican began to make any changes it was pressed to do so by the unanimous voice of the bishops of France, and that "the bishops of Germany" and "a great number of the bishops of Italy and other countries supported them." The Pope does not mention that this occurred eleven years earlier.

However, after all this and under a Pope of the reputed practical wisdom of Leo XIII, we do expect some adjustment to the requirements, or some decent concession to the intelligence, of our scientific age. We get nothing of the kind. Leo's Index is still a piece of humorous literature. It is for the far greater part a list of books that not one Catholic in a hundred thousand could get if he wished, and that no one today would have the slightest wish to read. I will consider in the next chapter why this is done and will remark here only that there is not a word of explanation in the various introductory documents to this Index. It includes about four thousand separate works and a hundred and eight authors, all of whose works are prohibited—in all about five thousand volumes. Of these about fifteen hundred are works of the seventeenth century, and there are few of them that can be consulted today except in a score or so of ancient libraries in Europe. The more literature multiplies and becomes increasingly skeptical, the less it enters the Index. Thirteen hundred volumes suffice for the nineteenth century, while there are twelve hundred for the eighteenth and, as I said, fifteen hundred for the seventeenth; and the total for the nineteenth century is swollen by putting on all the novels of Sue, the two Dumas, George Sand, Murger, and Zola, which no Frenchman is intimidated from reading.

The peculiar spirit of the whole business is seen in the fact that two exceptions are made to the new rule that works of the sixteenth century need no longer be listed, as they are presumably not obtainable. Are the two exceptions works that we reprint every few years and the good Catholic needs to be warned against? Well, they are the *Chronicon* of Conrad Lichtenau and an anonymous Italian work of which the title, translated, is *The Psalmist According to the Bible*. I should not think that even a Jesuit or a Paulist will venture to plead that they are really dangerous today. Of the fifteen hundred Seventeenth century works which are retained on this modernized Index Putnam has not courage to give more than thirty in his seven pages of selected names. Many of these even thirty are now practically unobtainable. Certainly fourteen out of the "fifteen" hundred are available only to a pure theological scholar, and they would just as certainly have not the least effect on him if he wasted his time reading them. Even if we take the few classics amongst them—Bayle, Bruno, Malebranche, Spinoza—not one Catholic in quarter of a million is likely to want to read them and, if he did, he could at once get permission. The eighteenth century works are almost equally inaccessible. Who in the world now wants to read J. Launoy? But this modern Pope gives him three times as much space on his Index as to any other writer.

As to the liberality of the Index and its accommodation to the new spirit, you have only to run your eye down even the selected list in Putnam. Many a Catholic theologian must have blushed when he found that these Roman pundits still kept on the Index the *Explanation of the Maxims of the Saints* of Archbishop Fénelon, one of the most pious and devoted prelates of the Church, only condemned because of the spite of Bishop Bossuet. A very large part of the Index is still devoted to literature of the ancient Jansenist controversy, which nearly everybody has forgotten. And where, since a great many names were omitted, was the common sense of retaining such books as Whateley's *Logic*, Maurice's *Theological Essays*, Lang's *Myth, Ritual and Religion* (Lang induced an English bishop to ask at Rome why it was condemned and got no answer), Goldsmith's *History of England*, and Wilkins' *Discovery of a New World*? And what did Catholic scholars say when they learned that they must not without special permission read Kant, Locke, Grotius, Hallam, Burnet, Comte, Taine, Sismondi, Descartes, Gregorovius, Lord Acton, and a hundred other indispensable writers?


The list is not only not liberal and sagacious, but it is devoid of common sense, and we shall have to try later to discover some reason why Rome continues to perpetrate these absurdities. But I must anticipate to the extent of saying that the new general rules, like the old rules, make the entire Index superfluous. They declare that the Catholic is forbidden to read any book of an apostate, heretic, a schismatic, any book which "attacks" (criticizes) the Roman faith or religion in general, or any book which treats of lewd or obscene subjects (for which one of the greatest scholars of the medieval Church, Albert the Great, monk and archbishop, is still on the Index). These rules could be put in three lines, and the rest of the forty-dollar book might disappear. The Index, remember, is not available for consultation by the ordinary Catholic, or even the ordi-

nary priest, when he wants to know whether a book is or is not against religion. It would not help him in nine cases out of ten even if it were available, for of the vast literature to which he has access in a modern public library very little is noted in the Index. He does not consult a priest every time he is going to open a book by a non-Catholic. In practice he reads until he discovers an anti-Catholic or skeptical note in the book, and then he is supposed to return it or put it on the fire.

However, we will return to that point. It remains only to say that the rules which restrict the Catholics' choice of reading are as tyrannical as ever; save for the gracious concession that if a heretic has written a book about, let us say, the flora of Connecticut or the trout of Lake Michigan, and has not insidiously introduced a criticism of the Pope or the Church or the Virgin Mary into it, the Catholic may now read that work. He is still forbidden to read any books commending "sorcery, divination, magic, the evocation of spirits, and other superstitions of this kind"—which is, of course, very modern and sagacious—and he must not read any book which defends "duelling, suicide or divorce." So the good American Catholic must be careful. Permission to read any of these things must be obtained from delegates of the Pope, even a bishop not being able to grant it unless he is specially authorized. In short, the only real modification is in the control of authors, printers and publishers; and I should not describe that so much as a concession to the age as a tardy acknowledgment that the age long ago took the matter into its own hands. Every Catholic author is still "bound" to submit to the bishop the manuscript of any book on religion or ethics, and a priest "ought" to submit his works even on other subjects. Catholic printers must still not print unauthorized manuscripts, and Catholic booksellers must not sell books against faith or morals. And it is emphatically said that these decrees apply to Catholics in every part of the world, and that the transgressor incurs excommunication at once, which means hell forever if he dies without release. For reading a heretic or apostate—I am very decidedly both—the Catholic incurs an excommunication from which the Pope alone can absolve.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INDEX TODAY

T need hardly be said that the reorganization of the Index by Leo XIII was a commendable failure. It reminded outsiders of the ingenious tailor in rural China who, being handed an old pair of trousers, and told to make a similar garment, faithfully reproduced all the holes and patches in the trousers he made. Cultivated Catholics were ashamed and annoyed, and those of them who ventured to say so in print—Houtin, Loisy, Mivart, etc.—were put on the Index and driven out of the Church. It was partly this dissatisfaction which led to the spread of the movement which was at first known to the Vatican as Americanism and later as an international mood called Modernism. An English representative of this published, in 1897, an anonymous

article in a London non-Catholic monthly (the *Contemporary Review*) which created a painful sensation in British Catholic circles and no little fluttering at Rome. In language that strained the limits of courtesy the writer, after an initial compliment to Leo XIII as the "gentle, cultured, conciliatory pontiff," in effect condemned his guidance of the Church in an age of grave difficulties as marked by a disastrous ignorance of contemporary scholarship. Here I need quote only (from Putnam) a few sentences in which the reaction of educated British Catholics, which was the same as that of American educated Catholics, to the Leonine Index, is described:

English Catholics have been played with of late in the matter of a new Index in a singularly inept and absurd manner, owing to the fact that the players at Rome are so densely ignorant concerning the state of things in England. The old Index was never supposed to be binding on the English Catholics, and, indeed, its provisions were such that it was practically almost a dead letter on the continent also. The new Index is, however, formally declared to be applicable to all countries, and great has been the distress which through its publication arose in the minds of a multitude of timid and scrupulous believers. Pressure was brought to bear upon Rome, which was forced at last to learn something of the condition of affairs in England, and finally supreme authority has had to draw in its horns and suffice it to be spread about in England that the new reformed Index does not apply here, and that in this happy country every condemned publication can be read, and any work on morals or religion published and circulated, without ecclesiastics having the power to prevent it.

The writer is hasty and inaccurate when he says that, if the Index does not apply in a country, Catholics may read any book. The general rule that they must not read books against faith or morals is impressed on them by the priests everywhere, and such reading has to be confessed, though in England and America there is now no question of excommunication. Otherwise this letter fairly represents the reaction of cultivated Catholics in America, England, France and Germany to the sham reforms of Leo XIII.

But cultivated Catholics are a dangerously small minority of the Pope's subjects, and such protests as that I have quoted were smothered under the smooth assurances of complete orthodoxy which Jesuits and others gave in the Catholic press. From these the Vatican gathered that the rebels were an insignificant group, in point of numbers, in every country, and, as Leo XIII was succeeded a few years later by the most ignorant Pope that has worn the tiara for many generations—another ironic piece of statesmanship, seeing the increasing difficulties of the age—the next phase was inevitable. What Pius X did was, in fact, not the violent break with the policy of his predecessor that it is often represented. Amongst the acts of Leo's later years were the publication of a new Index, with every absurdity of the first defiantly repeated, and the sanctioning of a new edition of the Canon Law with all the medieval claims, such as the right of the Church to put heretics to death. Leo never altered the medieval principles of the Church, but he had at least the prudence to dissimilate when it was necessary, blatantly asserted. To his peasant successor Modernism was as a red rag to a bull. He drove cultivated Catholics in every country out of the church or into silence and then fatuously struck a gold medal representing Modernism as a dragon which

he had slain. It was the most ghastly spectacle of ineptitude in modern times, but the press, as usual, made light of the Papal blunder and the public failed to appreciate it.

Benedict XV, the present Pope, is not easy to understand. The way in which Catholics, though now increasing in numbers, have advanced in influence in nearly every country during his pontificate, suggests that he has considerable ability. The war and its terrible sequels have given an opportunity for the kind of diplomatic intrigue in which he excels, and the Catholic authorities in America and Great Britain have made progress without any guidance from the Vatican, yet we must recognize a vigorous and in many ways successful rule of the Church. On the other hand, Benedict XV has pledged himself to the full medieval pretensions of his Church in a manner which reveals his colossal ignorance of modern culture, and the collapse of the Church in Spain and the delicate position in Italy and elsewhere suggest that in the end he will be found to have been just one more medieval blunderer, impelled by the strange delusion that in the twentieth century he can hold millions of educated Americans, Germans, and Britons, as well as his tens of millions of peasants and South American rustics, under a rule that is based on transparent forgeries and uses methods which outrage the modern spirit.

In 1929 he published a new Index, and one might describe it as an insolent and derisive reply to the last echoes of Modernism in his Church. The one modern feature of it is that the title page is in Italian, and the book is cheap, as if the Pope scorned any longer to keep the Index a sort of secret within a small domestic circle. The preface also is in Italian, and is written by—in spite of all the press compliments to him you read—that astonishingly stupid and medieval-minded Spaniard, Cardinal Merry del Val. He talks like a curate in a village pulpit. His glorious Church has successfully met countless persecutions and wet the earth with the blood of its martyrs—its martyrs, mind you, not of its millions of victims—and now it confronts, and might triumph over, a more “hellish” conspiracy than ever. As to what people say about this Index which is being given to the world once more, the Church smiles at these “banal insults.” There follow the prescriptions of the new Canon Law about heretics and wicked literature, but there is in this respect no change. The Index binds all Catholics in every country of the world, it affirms, and they are strictly forbidden to read any book against faith and morals.

In final evidence of the stupidity with which I charge the Index, I propose to give my readers, who will not find it possible to see the work itself, a complete section of it. When one merely selects titles from it one naturally chooses the more humorous or stupid, and the reader may be left wondering whether this fairly represents the body of the work. Although Dr. Putnam’s work runs to two large volumes, he gave merely a selection of names from the Leonine Index, and he chose these rather with an idea of minimizing its eccentricities. No writer on the Index gives the reader a quite fair idea of it by reproducing one complete section which is typical of the whole. And lest it be thought that I might choose a particularly feeble section, I just take all authors and works under the letter A. It is an amazing list, but I feel sure the reader will not deem it a waste of space. The titles of the books, in all sorts of languages, I need

not translate, as there are very few cases in which they are known to any modern reader. To save space, therefore, I will give only the name of the author and the century in which he wrote. Where the list gives the title of a book instead of an author's name, I generally say "Work of J. J. Spreng." This, then, is the sort of guidance which the Church of Rome furnishes in the year 1929:

- Abauzit, Firmin (18 century)
 Abbadie, Jacques (17 c.)
 Abbecedario (19 c.)
 A. B. C. (18 c.)
 Work of J. J. Spreng (18 c.)
 "Abominations of the Papacy" (17 c. Latin pamphlet)
 Work of Bon. Racine (18 c.)
 Work of J. M. de Prades (18 c.)
 Work of Quesnell (17 c.)
 Work of P. Macquer (18 c.)
 Abudaeus, Jos. (18 c.)
 Work of Quesnell (18 c.)
 Anonymous Spanish work (19 c.)
 Anonymous Italian work (18 c.)
 Anonymous French work (17 c.)
 Work of P. Jurien (17 c.)
 Achterfeldt, L. H. (19 c.)
 Acosta, Jos. (17 c.)
 Acrena, G. B. (19 c.)
 Acts of the Learned (Academic Review, 17 c., 18 c.)
 Acts (of a French Legation, 16 c.)
 Work of T. van der Croon (18 c.)
 Act of Appeal (French, 1701)
 Act of Appeal (French, 1718)
 Action Francaise (19 c. newspaper)
 Acton, Lord (two books with titles in German)
 "Advocate of the Devil" (18 c.)
 Adami, C. (18 c.)
 Adams, Melchior (17 c.)
 Work of Penzo (19 c.)
 Addison, Joseph ("Remarks on Several Parts of Italy," not reprinted since the 18 c.)
 Work of J. Tibbel (18 c.)
 Aerodins, P. (Proper name Ayrault, 17 c.)
 Aesina (17 c.)
 Work of J. A. Liorente (19 c.)
 Agobardus, works of (written in 9 c.)
 Agricola, B. (17 c.)
 Ahrens, H. (19 c.)
 Work of B. Stattler (18 c.)
 Alabaster, W. (Latin work of 1607, not reprinted)
 Alamin, F. de (18 c.)
 Albani, J. F. (18 c.)
 Albanus, A. (17 c.)
 Albarella, V. (19 c.)
 Alberius, C. (or Aubery, not reprinted since 17 c.)
 Alberti, G. A. (17 c.)
 Alberti, V. (18 c.)
 Albertinus, A. (17 c.)
 Albert the Great (two books, one on female anatomy, 13 c.)
 Work of A. Maquet (19 c., an exposure of Papal prisons)
 Alcuius, A. (17 c.)
 "Alciphron" (Bishop Berheley's work, 18 c.)
 Work of Jos. Lyserus (Leysers, 17 c.)
 Work of Henry by St. Ignatius (17 c.)
 Alexander, Natalis (Catholic, 17 c.)
 "Alfabeto litterale" (cheap trash, 17 c.)
 Alpieri, V. (19 c.)
 Algaroeti, F. (18 c.)
 Works of G. Mengozzi (19 c.)
 Allitz, P. S. (18 c.)
 Allix, E. (seven works, 17 c.)
 "Almanacca sacro" (few-cent almanac, 1863)
 "Almanaque demorcratico (ditto Spanish, 1864)
 Almeyda, M. N. (19 c.)
 Alstedius, J. H. (all works, 17 c.)
 Althusius, J. (17 c.)
 Alting, H. (all works, 17 c.)
 Alting, J. (all works, 17 c.)
 Altmeyer, J. J. (19 c.)
 Alva et Astorgo, P. (17 c.)
 Alvi, Ciro (novel, 1904)
 Alviset, V. (17 c.)
 Alzedo, M. (17 c.)
 Small work by Voltaire
 Amabile, Luigi (19 c.)
 Amama, S. (17 c.)
 Amari, M. (19 c.)
 Amat F. (19 c.)
 Amatus, M. (18 c.)
 Amaya, F. de (17 c.)
 Novel by G. Leti (17 c.)
 Amraziejus, J. (20 c.)
 Work of J. S. de Miraband (18 c.)
 Work of Desbords des Doires (17 c.)
 Amelot de la Houssaye, N. S. (three works, 17 c.)
 Amerius, W. (supposed to be English, all works, 17 c.)
 Amice, L. F. (19 c.)
 Work of A. Martinoli (19 c.)
 Ammann, F. S. (19 c.)
 Work of J. Niercassel (17 c.)
 Pascall's "Physics" (18 c.)
 Amsteliu, G. (18 c.)
 Amyraldus, Moses (17 c.)
 Work of L. S. Mercier (18 c.)
 Work of P. Tamburnini (18 c.)

- Work of F. M. de Marsy (18 c.)
 Work of G. Sciooppius (17 c.)
 Work of B. D'Altadena (19 c.)
 Andrea da S. Tomaso (17 c.)
 Andreae, J. V. (17 c.)
 Andringa, R. (17 c.)
 Anelli (19 c.)
 Angellini, F. (19 c.)
 Camden's Records (16 c.)
 Work of F. Paleavicino (17 c.)
 "Annals of Christian Philosophy" (20 c., philosophical religious work)
 Annals of Loigny (19 c.)
 Annals of the Church (18 c.)
 Amatus, P. (18 c.)
 Work of N. Le Tourneux (17 c.)
 Annual Canadian Institute (1868)
 Annual of Brussels University (1841)
 Ansaldius, F. (17 c.)
 Ansault (19 c.)
 Anonymous work (17 c.)
 Antero M. da S. B. (17 c.)
 Work of G. C. de Plaix (17 c.)
 Anonymous work (17 c.)
 "Anti-Pamela" (novel, 18 c.)
 Anonymous work (17 c.)
 Work of C. Cellarius (18 c.)
 Anonymous work (16 c.)
 Work of S. Berzi (19 c.)
 Work of M. Nannaroni (18 c.)
 Work of F. Forti (19 c.)
 Anonymous work (19 c.)
 Three anonymous works (18 c.)
 Work of F. Farres Smat (19 c.)
 Work of G. Pirot (17 c.)
 Anonymous work (16 c.)
 Work of P. Grenier (17 c.)
 Work of C. Mey (18 c.)
 Work of M. Petitdidier (17 c.)
 Anonymous work (17 c.)
 Aponte L. de (17 c.)
 Work of F. Giovanzana (19 c.)
 Aquilinius, C. (17 c.)
 Arocro, G. (18 c.)
 Work of A. Cicuto (19 c.)
 Archinard, A. (19 c.)
 Ardigo, R. (19 c.)
 Arduini, C. (19 c.)
 Aretino, P. (17 c.)
 Arnauld, A. (ten works, 17 c.)
 Arnauld, A. (son, eight works, 17 c.)
 Arnisaens, H. (all works, 17 c.)
 Arnoldus, C. (17 c.)
 Work of C. A. Rupertus (17 c.)
 Work of J. H. Ursinus (17 c.)
 Arnoldus, G. (18 c.)
 Arnoldus, N. (18 c.)
 Decrees of Paris Parlement (six, 17 c., 18 c.)
 Work of H. J. Dulaurens (18 c.)
 Anonymous work (19 c.)
 Arsdekin, R. (supposed to be name of Irish Jesuit, 17 c.)
 Work of F. Bruys (19 c.)
 Anonymous work (18 c.)
 Work of G. Morardo (19 c.)
 Work of Lopez Royo (18 c.)
 Work of L. Fromondus (17 c.)
 Arthusius, G. (17 c.)
 Anonymous Work (17 c.)
 Arumaeus, D. (17 c.)
 Ascanius, D. (18 c.)
 Aslacus, C. (17 c.)
 Work of F. D. Guerrazzi (19 c.)
 Collection of Erotic Stories (17 c.)
 Work of J. C. Erkcluis (18 c.)
 Work of D. Batacrhi (19 c.)
 Work of P. Mintaert (17 c.)
 Acts of the Synod of Pistoja, 1794
 Aubé, B. (from books, 19 c.)
 Aubert de la Versé, N. (18 c.)
 Aubry, J. C. (18 c.)
 Audisio, G. (19 c.)
 Audoul, G. (18 c.)
 Work of D. Pilé (18 c.)
 Augustinus, A. (17 c.)
 Anonymous work, (17 c.)
 Aulard, F. A. (19 c.)
 Aurelius, P. (17 c.)
 Auruccio, V. (17 c.)
 Work of G. Spilimbergo (18 c.)
 Work of F. Ricker (18 c.)
 Anonymous work, (17 c.)
 Work of M. de Barcos (17 c.)
 Anonymous work, (17 c.)
 Anonymous work (18 c.)
 Ariancini, D. (20 c.)
 Work of P. Desforages (18 c.)
 Avendano Eztenenza, M. de (17 c.)
 Aventrote, J. (17 c.)
 Anonymous work, (17 c.)
 Anonymous work (18 c.)
 Anonymous work (18 c.)
 Work of P. St. Martin (19 c.)
 Work of Quesnel (18 c.)
 Work of J. Sinnichinus (17 c.)
 Work of A. de Witte (18 c.)
 Ayala-Rosso, M. (19 c.)
 Aygualo de Izco, W. (19 c.)
 Aymon, J. (18 c.)
 Ayrault, P. (17 c.)
 Azevedo Araujo, M. de (19 c.)

I was repeatedly tempted to shorten this dreary list, but probably most of my readers will now have for the first time a clear and just idea what Rome's famous Index of Prohibited Books, in its very latest form, really is. The works listed under A are about one-fifteenth of the whole, and they are a fair sample.

The reader will no longer wonder at my expressions of impatience and disdain, and he will be able to smile at all the apologies of apologists. The Index is the most ludicrous work published in the last ten years. When we take the date of publication, not condemnation, of the books, we see that Dr. Putnam's analysis of their antiquity is not just. In this list there are a hundred works of the seventeenth century or earlier, nearly seventy of the eighteenth century, fifty of the nineteenth, and four of the twentieth. As I said, the Index grows smaller as the world's literature grows larger and more anti-religious. You will see also the truth of my saying that it is overwhelmingly a list of works which a millionaire could not buy and not one person in a million could or would consult. To say that this Index is "a catalogue of great literature" is as absurd as the apologetic plea that it is at least a literary-historical list of some value. More than half the books never were of any importance—four-fifths do not come under the notice of even the most pedantic professor of literature. Only about a score belong to the last half century, and there are not ten of these that anybody wants to read today. I feel sure that the reader will agree with me that there are not ten books in these three hundred which even one Catholic in fifty thousand would be tempted to read if he could get it, so all the talk about a solicitous Church protecting its members by the Index is hollow mockery. As to morals, less than a score of books in the three hundred are condemned for indecency, and only one or two of those are today available.

There remains therefore only one question: Why in the name of common sense the Papacy perpetrates such intellectual atrocities in the twentieth century? I have already said that Catholic apologies for this most flagrant blunder of their Church are scarce. It is not mentioned in most of the American apologetic works. The writers prefer to treat it, in spite of the stern insistence of the Pope, as an Italian eccentricity which does not concern them. That is to say, they write page after page about the wisdom, the statesmanship, the profound comprehension of the age which distinguish their supreme authority, and then they dismiss one of the most solemn and repeated Acts of the Papacy as an indefensible piece of stupidity. The sample I have given shows that the Index is of no more practical value in Spain or Italy than in America, so one cannot settle the matter apart from the Pope's words, by saying that the Index is an affair of the Latin, not the English-speaking, world.

What attempts there are to explain the Index are respectfully gathered by Dr. Putnam, who had the assistance of several priests. One of the most vigorous of these apologies is quoted from the leading British Catholic periodical, the *Tablet*, the exclusive and rather aristocratic organ of the better educated Catholics of England. I had better quote the essential passage of it:

It may safely be asserted that not a little of the ordinary criticism of the regulations of the Index is due in many cases to insularity. Probably out of every hundred Englishmen or Americans who rail against the restrictions of the Index, not a tithe has any direct acquaintance with, or takes any due account of, the flood of bitterly anti-Christian literature, often infidel, immoral, and blasphemous, and almost always insidiously polemical, which is poured over Italy and the continent generally by the masonic and anti-clerical press. It is in great measure this degrading abuse

of one of the noblest faculties of civilized society, and the need of duly protecting the minds of the masses, that the provisions of the Index are specially designed to meet.

The writer (most probably a Jesuit) is, of course, quite aware that not one of his Catholic readers will ever see the Index and he can say what he likes. The fact is that the output of anti-Catholic and skeptical literature has been greater than ever in the last thirty years, yet only *four* authors have been put on the Index, and only about twenty in the last half century; and more than half of these are works of idealist writers. The Index does not even attempt to protect Catholics against current literature, or the only literature they ever see; and the writer presently admits that Rome has privately assured the English bishop—it is the same in America—that they need not enforce the Index, but trust the Catholic to find out what endangers his faith or morals. In short, neither Hilgers nor any other apologist, as far as I can find, attempts to explain why the Papacy periodically and solemnly republishes this list of forgotten and inaccessible works, with a few authors of such distinction and permanent interest that it is futile to forbid the reading of them.

We have only to set aside the legend of the statesmanship and sagacity of the Vatican and reflect on the facts themselves if we would understand the situation. The prefaces and introductions to the various recent Indexes make it clear that the Popes have not the faintest idea of reprinting the list because of its historical interest. These, they say emphatically, are books which no Catholic in the world may read. In other words, this whole business of the Index proves once more the complete failure of the Papacy at all times to understand its age. There is plenty of ability in Rome, but the intellectual environment is so musty, so sporific, so stupefying, that the most outrageous blunders are committed, especially when, as in the case of the Index and the Church Law, the documents are kept within a narrow clerical circle, while a false account of them is given (as I have quoted) to the Catholic world generally.

You may conclude that at all events the Index, however silly it may be, is today a quite innocuous piece of silliness. It is—today. The Pope might abolish it tomorrow, and the Catholic would no more be free to “read both sides,” as he is so fond of urging the Protestant to do, than he was a hundred years ago. It is part of the moral theology of the Church, stamped deep on the minds of members in every country, that it is a “mortal sin” (incurring eternal damnation) to read criticism of the faith or erotic books. The only modern difference is that the punishment in the future is no longer anticipated by punishment in the present, and that printers and booksellers can no longer be bullied. The only real interest of the Index is that it reminds the world of the heavy and paralyzing tyranny which Rome laid upon thought in half of Europe for three centuries, and that it symbolizes the very real tyranny which the priests exercise, in the sole interest of the Church, over the minds of their followers today, as I explained in the introduction. It will be abolished in the course of the present century, as the Inquisition was abolished in the last century.

He denounces people's pet notions and makes them like it!

\$1 Astounding Bargain!
Best Liberal Reading
1,157 Pages, 300,000
Words—Almost Two
Pounds for \$1.00!

Here are books that will startle you into new lines of thought! A handy pocket library of books of liberal viewpoint! The whole set \$1—we pay the postage!



Works of CLARENCE
DARROW

18 THRILLING SECTIONS—27 TITLES

Is Capital Punishment Justified?
Debate vs. Judge Talley.

Is Prohibition Right? Debate vs.
John Haynes Holmes.

Is Life Worth Living? Debate vs.
Frederick Starr.

Is the Human Race Getting Any-
where? Debate vs. Starr.

Facing Life Fearlessly. Courageous
Philosophy of Life.

Lord's Day Alliance. Debunking
"Blue" Sundays.

Insects and Men: Instinct and
Reason.

How Voltaire Fooled Priest and
King.

The Skeleton in the Closet. Famous
Lecture.

Essay on Walt Whitman.

Essay on John P. Altgeld.

Realism in Literature and Art.

Essay on Robert Burns.

Essay on Geo. Burman Foster.

Some Paragraphs Addressed to
Socialists.

The Ordeal of Prohibition.
The Edwardses and the Jukeses.
Question of Heredity.

Are We Machines? Debate vs. Dr.
Will Durant.

Can the Individual Control His Con-
duct? Debate vs. Prof. Smith.

Dry-Law Pro and Con. Debate vs.
Wayne B. Wheeler.

Do Human Beings Have Free Will?
Debate vs. Prof. Foster.

Resist Not Evil. Discussion of
Non-resistance.

An Eye for an Eye. Complete
novel.

Plea in Defense of Loeb and Leo-
pold, the Boy Murderers.

Darrow vs. Bryan in the Famous
Scopes Anti-Evolution Case.

The Defense of a Negro. Famous
Dr. Sweet Case in Detroit.

A Day With Clarence Darrow.

Easily Worth \$3
All Yours for \$1

This is unquestionably the great-
est bargain ever offered in the
annals of printing! These works
of Darrow comprise 1,157 pages,
or 300,000 words, almost two
pounds of excellent reading—all
for \$1 postpaid to your address no
matter where you live!

Send \$1 With This Blank

Haldeman-Julius Publications,
Girard, Kansas

I enclose \$1. Send me WORKS OF
DARROW, 18 sections, 27 titles, post-
paid.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

*Let Joseph McCabe Show You How to Become a
Clear and Logical Thinker*

The Art of Thinking Logically

By Joseph McCabe

COME to school and learn from Joseph McCabe by reading these six volumes, containing 180,000 words of sound instruction. This work is divided into six sections, as follows:

1. The Art of Thinking and Reasoning Logically (logic and its precepts).
2. The Complete Story of Philosophy (an entire history of logical thinking).
3. A Manual of Human Morality (a logical examination of the theories of ethics and the laws of behavior).
4. The Story of Human Education (the logical science of teaching people to think).
5. All About Psycho-Analysis and Applied Psychology (investigations and logical theories of the mind).
6. Important Facts About the Progress of Science (a logical summary of man's knowledge).

This work will help you make full use of your mental faculties. It covers a wide field. This collection is the logic and philosophy section, word for word, of Joseph McCabe's famous keys to culture. Regular price is \$1.80, but we are cutting the price for a limited time. Send only \$1.05 and use the order blank below.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

ORDER BLANK FOR "THE ART OF THINKING LOGICALLY"

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas.

Enclosed find \$1.05, which is payment in full for the complete set by Joseph McCabe, entitled "The Art of Thinking Logically," in 6 vols. Carriage charges prepaid. It is understood that this set is the complete logic and philosophy section of McCabe's keys to culture.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

Only \$1.52 for the 8-Volume Masterpiece of Historical Research by the World's Greatest Scholar

A Complete Outline of History

By Joseph McCabe

JOSEPH McCABE, the author of this 8-volume masterpiece, is considered the world's greatest authority on history. We consider this 8-volume set of books his most important contribution to the science of history.

This set is already being used in many of the largest universities in the world, but it was written for laymen, for the man in the street, in understandable English.

This 8-volume work of history contains 240,000 words, truly a gigantic work, under the following eight sections, each occupying an entire volume:

1. Beginning of Man's Story of Himself (the dawn of history and the origin of civilization).
2. The Wonders of Ancient Egypt and Babylon (civilization of the Nile Valley and the Persian Gulf).
3. The Splendors of Greece and Rome (the culture of ancient Athens and Rome).
4. The Strange Civilizations of China and India (Asiatic culture linked with Babylon).
5. The True Picture of Europe in the Middle Ages (Medieval degradation of Art, Science and Culture).
6. The Stirring Story of the Rise of Modern Europe (from the Reformation to the French Revolution).
7. The Dawn of the New Age and Birth of the Modern Spirit (the triumph of rationalism in world history).
8. A Graphic Account of the History of America (American growth and progress).

It is no exaggeration to say that this *Complete Outline of History* is far superior to any outline in the literature of any country. We are offering this gigantic work for only \$1.52, which pays for the entire set of eight volumes. The regular price is \$2.40 but for a limited time the price has been reduced to \$1.52. This collection is the historical section, word for word, of McCabe's famous keys to culture.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS, GIRARD, KANSAS

ORDER BLANK FOR "A COMPLETE OUTLINE OF HISTORY"

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas.

Enclosed find \$1.52, which is payment in full for the complete set by Joseph McCabe, entitled "A Complete Outline of History," in 8 vols. Carriage charges prepaid. It is understood that this set is the complete history department of McCabe's keys to culture.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State.....

"DUST" IS A STORY HUNDREDS OF MARRIED MEN AND WOMEN WILL RECOGNIZE. AND YET NO ONE EVER TOLD IT BEFORE. NO OTHER AMERICAN WRITER EVER HAD THE COURAGE. IT IS TOO STARK—TOO RUTHLESS—TOO MERCILESSLY SHORN OF SENTIMENTALITY. NO ONE PERSON COULD HAVE TOLD IT! ONLY A MAN AND A WOMAN TOGETHER COULD HAVE PROBED SO DEEP INTO LIFE AND SEEN IT SO COMPLETELY. MR. AND MRS. HALDEMAN-JULIUS HAVE THE GIFT OF RARE UNDERSTANDING. THOUGH THIS IS THEIR FIRST NOVEL, IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THEIR REPUTATIONS ESTABLISHED AS WRITERS IN OTHER FIELDS. "DUST" IS UNLIKE THE USUAL EPHEMERAL WORK—IT IS STILL READ; AS CARL SANDBURG REMARKED, "IT LINGERS ON" AND STAYS WITH ONE. IT HAS BEEN DESCRIBED AS "A WORTHY VOLUME IN THE MID-WESTERN EPIC THAT OUR YOUNGER AUTHORS HAVE BEGUN TO WRITE." THE THEME OF "DUST" OPENS AND CLOSES THE STORY AND RUNS ALL THROUGH IT, FROM FIRST PAGE TO LAST.

"DUST"

By E. and M. Haldeman-Julius

REVIEWS:

Boston Transcript—

"From beginning to end, DUST is a work of art, a searching probe into human souls brought together by an indifferent fate and parted by a caprice of nature."

New York Evening Post—

"DUST is a highly worthy addition to the best in our contemporary letters."

Chicago Tribune—

"DUST is a true work of art. It is a joy to find a first novel so brimming with promise."

New Jersey Leader—

"This gripping story is bound to take its place as one of the important first novels of the year—indeed one of the high water marks in a season that is rich in the production of notable literature."

Philadelphia Public Ledger—

"The authors have produced a most remarkable novel of the Middle West, a masterly piece of work which touches every emotional chord, as well as making a strong intellectual appeal."

New York World—

"In truth a work of literary note—a tragedy set forth with such dignity and power that it should compel reading."

PRICES:

39c

Paperbound edition, cover in attractive colors, substantial, handy size, thoroughly readable. The complete novel—not a word omitted—exactly the same as the cloth-bound edition. Now sent postpaid anywhere for 39c per copy.

Clothbound edition, 251 pages, with protecting jacket. Large, clear type. A neat piece of book-manufacturing craftsmanship. Published at \$1.90; now sent postpaid to any address for \$1.35 per copy.

\$1.35

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Dept. C-96, Girard, Kansas

What Can A Free Man Believe?

A Realistic Philosophy of Life Is Given in This Latest Book by
E. Haldeman-Julius—A Big Book for Only \$1

There is no tone of regret in disillusionment—a tone that is sentimentally stressed by some writers—in this latest volume of free-minded discussion by E. Haldeman-Julius. The picture of our age as lost and hopeless and empty-handed because it has found out the unsatisfactory character of the old “certainties” of religion and moralism does not apply to persons who have really emancipated their minds and who have the mental courage that goes with free thought—this is shown by Mr. Haldeman-Julius in these daring and withal wholesome chapters on religion, morals, philosophy, social ideals and man’s attitude toward nature.

The old “certainties”? They were the old uncertainties, says Mr. Haldeman-Julius; they represented shifting ground; upon them could be raised no enduring foundation of intellectual and realistic life. Science and rationalism have destroyed the old faith in the old mis-called “certainties” for anyone who has the mental quickening of a critical attitude. There is only one course for the man or woman who begins to think and that is the course of simple, persistent, unafraid realism. What is there to be afraid of? We can’t change life by foolish dogmas and sentimentalities of faith. Man can make the best of his life only by facing life with a clear mind and with a resolution to see and deal with things as they are. False philosophies and theologies are not consolations for men—they are traps for men and women.

This latest book by E. Haldeman-Julius covers a lot of territory. Among other very interesting features, it discusses carefully and sanely the true approach to ideas, the nature and the purposes of thought, the values that are involved in the observation of life and in reflection about life. Free thinkers will enjoy this book and all readers will find it intellectually stimulating and clarifying. This is a big book of 177 pages, 5½ by 8½ inches in size, bound in stiff card covers, and priced at only \$1.

ORDER BLANK FOR “WHAT CAN A FREE MAN BELIEVE?”

Haldeman-Julius Publications, Girard, Kansas

I am enclosing \$1, for which send me, postpaid, a copy of *What Can a Free Man Believe?* by E. Haldeman-Julius.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....